



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

~~200 g~~
~~14. a.~~ 1



**PRINTED BY TAYLOR AND FRANCIS,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.**

CONTENTS.

	Page
On English Orthography, more particularly with reference to the spelling of the Passive Participle. By JAMES YATES, Esq.	7
Some Remarks on a Statue of Endymion, illustrative of a passage in Lucian. By JAMES YATES, Esq.....	8
On certain Welsh Names of Places preserved in English Compounds. By EDWIN GUEST, Esq.....	9
On the Etymology of the word <i>Trap-rock</i> . By HENSLEIGH WEDGWOOD, Esq.....	12
A Notice of European Grammars and Lexicons of the Sanskrit Language. By HORACE HAYMAN WILSON, Esq.....	13
On the Languages of the Papuan or Negrito Race scattered through the Australian and other Asiatic islands. By ROBERT GORDON LATHAM, Esq.	37
On the Origin of the Phrase 'Wager of Law.' By PETER STAFFORD CAREY, Esq.	57
On the Classification of the Chinese Roots. By J. F. DAVIS, Esq.	58
On the Derivatives of the Welsh word <i>gwy</i> . By the Rev. JOHN WALTERS, Rector of Landough, Glamorganshire. Communicated by the Rev. JOHN JONES (Tegid)	65
On certain Inflexions of the Old-English Adjective. By EDWIN GUEST, Esq.....	65
On Scythia and the surrounding countries, according to Herodotus. By FRANCIS W. NEWMAN, Esq.	77
On Plato's Number. By the Rev. JOHN W. DONALDSON	81
On the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands. By the Rev. RICHARD GARNETT	91
On the Structure of the Russian Verb. By FRANCIS H. TRITHEN, Esq. Communicated by HORACE HAYMAN WILSON, Esq.	96
On English Gentile Nouns, and more particularly on their Secondary Use as Names of Districts. By EDWIN GUEST, Esq.	103
On the probable Relations of the Picts and Gael with the other Tribes of Great Britain. By the Rev. RICHARD GARNETT	119

200 g
14. a. 1



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

- Rev. J. P. Lee, *Head Master of Birmingham School.*
 Dr. Lee, F.R.S., *Doctors' Commons.*
 J. G. Shaw Lefevre, Esq., *Board of Trade, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Dr. Frederick Leighton, *7 Upper Gower-street.*
 George Cornwall Lewis, Esq., *Somerset House.*
 Rev. Henry Geo. Liddell, *Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford.*
 Rev. W. Linwood, *Student of Christ Church; Oxford.*
 The Right Rev. the Bishop of Llandaff.
 Rev. J. Lodge, *Librarian, Cambridge.*
 The Right Rev. the Bishop of London.
 The Ven. Archdeacon Lonsdale, *Principal of King's College, London.*
 Edmund L. Lushington, Esq., *Professor of Greek, Glasgow.*
 The Right Honourable T. B. Macaulay, *Albany.*
 Rev. Dr. McCaul, *Professor of Hebrew, King's College, London.*
 Rev. Dr. Major, *King's College, London.*
 H. Malden, Esq., *Professor of Greek, University College, London.*
 Mr. Serjeant Manning.
 C. P. Mason, Esq., *70 High Holborn.*
 Rev. E. Massie, *Durham.*
 Rev. F. Maurice, *Professor of English Literature, King's College, London.*
 Rev. C. Merivale, *Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. Dr. Mill, *Christian Advocate, Cambridge.*
 Rev. H. H. Milman, *Prebendary of Westminster.*
 Charles Neate, Esq., *Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.*
 F. W. Newman, Esq., *late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.*
 James Charles Newton, Esq., *St. James's-square.*
 Rev. Dr. Ollivant, *late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. Thomas Williamson Peile, *Head Master of Repton School.*
 The Very Rev. the Dean of Peterborough, F.R.S.
 L. Hayes Petit, Esq., F.R.S., *New Square, Lincoln's Inn.*
 J. G. Phillimore, Esq., *Temple.*
 Rev. G. Phillips, *Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. Mr. Pickering, *Eton.*
 Thomas Pell Platt, Esq., *late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. James Raine, *Librarian, Durham.*
 W. Ramsay, Esq., *Professor of Humanity, Glasgow.*
 Richard Rayley, Esq., *Upper Berkeley-street, Portman-square.*
 Rev. H. Jenkyns Rees, *Rector of Cascob, Presteign, Radnorshire.*
 Rev. R. C. Renouard, B.D., *late Fellow of Sydney College, Cambridge.*
 Charles Richardson, Esq., *47 Upper Baker-street.*
 John Robson, Esq., *3 Medbourn-street, St. Pancras.*
 Rev. J. Meadows Rodwell, *9 Park-terrace, Liverpool-road, Islington.*
 Rev. Jos. Romilly, *Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 R. W. Rothman, M.D., *Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Prof. Royle, F.R.S., *King's College, London.*
 Rev. Rob. Scott, *late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.*
 Daniel Sharpe, Esq., *2 Adelphi Terrace.*
 Prof. Sharpey, F.R.S., *University College, London.*

- Rev. J. G. Sheppard, *Assistant Master of Repton School.*
 Rev. Richard Shillito, *Classical Lecturer, King's College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. Dr. Singer, *Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.*
 Rev. J. Smith, *Fellow and Tutor of Caius College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. Philip Smith, *Cheshunt.*
 Rev. Dr. J. P. Smith, F.R.S., *Homerton.*
 Dr. W. Smith, *16 Barnsbury Villas, Islington.*
 S. R. Solly, Esq., F.R.S., *Surge Hill, Kings Langley, Hert*
 Rev. J. Sortain, *Brighton.*
 Rev. Thomas Stack, *Junior Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin.*
 Rev. Arthur P. Stanley, *Fellow of University College, Oxford.*
 Sir George Staunton, Bart., M.P., F.R.S.
 Rev. A. C. Tait, *Head Master of Rugby School.*
 H. Fox Talbot, Esq., F.R.S., *Laycock Abbey, Wiltshire.*
 Rev. James Tate, *Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's.*
 Rev. Dr. Tatham, *Master of St. John's College, Cambridge.*
 J. J. Tayler, Esq., *Manchester.*
 Richard Taylor, Esq.
 Rev. W. H. Thompson, *Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Benjamin Thorpe, Esq., *Richmond.*
 The Ven. Archdeacon Thorp, *Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. Dr. Todd, *Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.*
 C. V. Trevelyan, Esq., *Treasury.*
 Prof. Twiss, *University College, Oxford.*
 W. J. Vaux, Esq., *British Museum.*
 Raymond de Véricour, Esq., *Fortescue House, Twickenham.*
 Jacob Waley, Esq., *22 Devonshire Place.*
 Rev. Dr. Wall, *Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.*
 Albert Way, Esq., *Piccadilly.*
 Hensleigh Wedgwood, Esq., *late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. W. Whewell, B.D., *Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. Rob. Whiston, *Head Master of Rochester School, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. Dr. Williams, *Warden of New College, Oxford.*
 Rev. Robert Williams, *Llangadwaladr, Oswestry.*
 Rev. Dr. Williamson, *Head Master of Westminster School.*
 Robert Hindley Wilkinson, Esq., *Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.*
 H. Hayman Wilson, Esq., *Professor of Sanskrit, Oxford.*
 Rev. W. Wilson, *Newbury.*
 Rev. Dr. Wiseman, *President of Oscott College, Birmingham.*
 H. A. Woodham, Esq., *Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge.*
 Rev. Dr. Worthington, *3 Mecklenburgh Square.*
 Rev. Dr. Wynter, *President of St. John's College, and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford.*
 James Yates, Esq., F.R.S., *49 Upper Bedford Place.*
 Joseph Brooks Yates, Esq., *West Dingle, Liverpool.*

Officers of the Society.

President, the Bishop of St. David's ; *Vice-Presidents*, the Bishops of London, Durham, and Hereford ; *Ordinary Members of the Council*, Rev. Prof. Browne, Rev. Dr. Cramer, Rev. W. Cureton, T. F. Ellis, Esq., Rev. Richard Garnett, E. Guest, Esq., Rev. Dr. Hawtrey, John M. Kemble, Esq., Prof. Key, Prof. Latham, Rev. Dr. Lee, G. C. Lewis, Esq., Ven. Archd. Lonsdale, Rev. Dr. M^cCaul, Prof. Malden, Rev. Dr. Mill, Rev. H. H. Milman, Rev. Prof. Whewell, Prof. Wilson, James Yates, Esq. ; *Treasurer*, H. Wedgwood, Esq., 16 Gower Street, Bedford Square ; *Secretary*, E. Guest, Esq., 4 King's Bench Walk, Temple.

The Rules drawn up for the regulation of the Society were then read by the Secretary.

Professor Malden took the opportunity of stating that some inconvenience had resulted from the strict wording of the fourth resolution passed at the General Meeting. The Council had completed their number of twenty, and appointed a Treasurer and a Secretary, the former not being one of the twenty Ordinary Members. By the Rules which had just been read, the Treasurer and Secretary appointed by the Society at the next Annual General Meeting would be *ex-officio* Members of the Council, but he believed the duties of Treasurer could not be efficiently discharged during the present Session, unless the Society would empower the Council to summon that officer to their Meetings.

It was then moved by the Rev. Richard Burgess, B.D.,—That the Treasurer and Secretary, appointed by the Council for the present Session, be *ex-officio* Members of the Council.

The motion was seconded by the Rev. G. C. Renouard, B.D., and carried unanimously.

The Rules drawn up for the regulation of the Society were then submitted to the Meeting, and, with some slight alterations, were unanimously adopted.

Professor Latham commenced the reading of a paper on the dialects of the Papuan or Negrito race, scattered through the Australian and other Asiatic islands. The paper will be finished at a future Meeting.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

DECEMBER 9, 1842.

No. 2.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S, President,
in the Chair.

The following communications were read :—

1. A Letter from James Yates, Esq. to the Secretary, containing remarks on English Orthography, more particularly with reference to the spelling of the Passive Participle.

The author considered the adoption of an improved system of orthography by the Editors of the Philological Journal (Camb. 1832) an example worthy of imitation on the part of the Philological Society. Many peculiarities in our present modes of spelling may be traced to the printers, who since the latter part of the last century have exercised a general control over English orthography. They have often shown an ignorance of the first principles of our language. Their mode of spelling the passive participle seems based on the supposition, that it was regularly formed from the verb by the addition of *ed*, and that the use of a simple *d* or *t* indicated a contraction of such final syllable. This supposition is clearly erroneous; is contrary to the genius of the English language, and to the analogies which are afforded us by the other Indo-European tongues. By spelling the passive participle *as it is pronounced*, we should, in many cases, be returning to modes of spelling which were in general use at the beginning of the last century. We should also secure many important advantages. The pronunciation of this class of words would be made easy to the foreigner, and our language exhibited in a form that would show its connexion with the cognate tongues, and its accordance with the general principles of speech.

Numerous examples were given in illustration of these views. When the verb ended in *d* or *t*, the participle was formed by the addition of an *ed*, as *add, added; fold, folded, &c.*; the *d* or *t* being doubled to indicate the short vowel, as *nod, nodded; fit, fitted, &c.* In other cases *d* alone was added, as *stay, stayd; free, freed; seem, seemd; plan, pland; nail, naid, &c.* But when the final letter of the verb was one of the *tenués* (otherwise surds, or whisper-letters), *t* was substituted, as *fix, fixt; wrap, wrapt; ask, askt; snatch, snatcht; dash, dasht, &c.* The various examples were ranged according to the ending of the verb, and the author entered at some length into the consideration of such cases as were likely to lead to ambiguity, for the most part following out the principles advocated by Mr. Hare in the Philological Journal, vol. i. p. 640.

After the reading of this paper a discussion arose as to the doctrines advanced in it, and generally as to the best mode of reforming our English orthography.

2. Some Remarks on a Statue of Endymion, illustrative of a passage in Lucian. By James Yates, Esq.

The recumbent statue of white marble, which is now deposited in the sixth room of the Townley Gallery in the British Museum, was found at Roma Vecchia in 1774. Dallaway calls it a statue of Adonis*. It has also been denominated a statue of Mercury†. But no example or authority has been brought to support either of these two suppositions, and I apprehend none such can be brought. Adonis, if he were ever represented in a statue, might be expected to exhibit something Oriental in his attire, or to show the marks of the boar's tusk on his thigh; nor is there any reason for making him sleep. To represent Mercury asleep would have been as incongruous as to exhibit Somnus awake. There does not appear to be any reason why the swift messenger of gods and men should even lie in a recumbent attitude, nor can I recollect any instance in which he wears cothurni.

That this beautiful production of ancient art was intended for Endymion, will, I think, appear from the following considerations:—

The fable of Endymion and the Moon was a favourite subject with the ancient artists. It is found in bas-reliefs‡, and is represented in a picture discovered at Portici§. The figure of Endymion is also engraved on gems||. These representations of the story vary in their circumstances; but the most common exhibits Diana, or the Moon, dismounting from her chariot, and advancing towards Endymion with her eyes fixed upon him in admiration, whilst he, in the costume of a hunter or of a shepherd, lies stretched asleep upon a rock. Of these there is one which is more especially applicable to the illustration of our present subject. It is a marble bas-relief, formerly belonging to the Giustiniani collection at Rome. An engraving of it was published A.D. 1631, in the *Galleria Giustiniani*, vol. ii. pl. 110. Another engraving of it appeared (at p. 52.) in Sandrart's *Sculpturae Veteris Admiranda*, published at Nuremberg in 1680, and this engraving is copied (at fol. O) in the first volume of the *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum* of Gronovius. In the latter engraving, both as published by Sandrart and as copied by Gronovius, the whole piece is reversed, so that the right hand is exhibited as if it were the left. The bas-relief, which is made known to us by these publications, displays the whole story of the discovery of Endymion by the Moon. The goddess is represented descending from her car, proceeding towards the sleeping youth, and surrounded by a train of winged genii and other attendants. Endymion is represented as he is seen in the drawing, No. 2¶, which is copied from the original engraving in the *Galleria Giustiniani*. In this we observe the crook,

* Anecdotes of the Arts in England, p. 303.

† Library of Entertaining Knowledge, Townley Gallery, vol. i. p. 246.

‡ Museo Pio Clementino, tomo iv. tav. 16.

§ Antichità d' Ercolano, tomo iii. tav. 3.

|| Lippert's Dactylitheca.

¶ Two drawings were exhibited to the meeting in illustration of the subject discussed in this paper.

STATUTE OF RESOLUTIONS THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

*A. Proceedings of the Philological Society Vol I p. 8
and Yucca's Ternum Anagnini. Part I p. 201*

or pedum, which has fallen from his left hand, whilst his right hand is turned over his head, exactly as it is in the Townley statue. That this position of the right arm and hand was very commonly assumed by the artists of antiquity as characteristic of Endymion, appears from the description of him in Lucian's Dialogue between Venus and the Moon. The latter says, in answer to Venus, that her favourite Endymion is particularly beautiful: "οταν υποβαλόμενος ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας τὴν χλαμύδα κυθεύδῃ, τῇ λαιᾷ μὲν ἔχων τὰ ἀκόντια ἤδη ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς ὑπορρέοντα, ἡ δεξιὰ δὲ περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐς τὸ ἄνω ἐπικεκλασμένη ἐπιπρέπει τῷ προσώπῳ περικειμένη, ὁ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου λελυμένος ἀναπνέει τὸ ἀμβρόσιον ἐκεῖνο ἄσθμα.—Lucian, *Dial. Deor.* XI. This passage proves that the ancients in their conceptions of the sleeping Endymion often represented him with his right arm elevated and turned over his head, or in the exact attitude which we observe in the statue of the Townley Gallery.

The costume, which is very carefully executed in this statue, may be regarded as the costume either of a hunter or of a shepherd, since the dress of these two characters did not differ materially, if at all. It consists of boots (*cothurni*), a scarf (*chlamys*), and a petasus tied under the chin. The only circumstance of any importance in which this statue differs from the description given by Lucian, and from the bas-reliefs and painting above quoted, is that the left hand touches the fibula of his scarf instead of holding darts, a hunting spear, or a crook. In its style this statue is elegant and highly finished. It is a representation of human nature, and not of a divine or ideal existence. It is instructive as an example of Greek costume. With regard to its use or destination it is impossible to form anything more than conjectures. It may have been deposited as a donarium in some temple consecrated to Diana, or it may have adorned a garden or a grove attached to the villa of some opulent Roman.

3. On certain Welsh Names of Places preserved in English Compounds. By Edwin Guest, Esq.

ORKNEY.—The Welsh word *orc* signifies that which is extreme, a limit, a border (Owen); and *Orc* is the name given to the Orkney group in the Welsh Triads.

"The three primary adjoining islands of the Isle of Britain, *Orc*, *Manaw*, and *Gwyth* (that is, Orkney, Man, and Wight); and afterwards the sea broke the land, so that *Mon* (Anglesea) became an island, and in the same manner the isle of *Orc* was broken," &c.

From *Orc* the Latins got their *Orcades*. The early English settlers appear to have changed the Welsh name (as they did most other Celtic names of places) into a feminine substantive *Orce*, gen. *Orcan*. *Orcan ig* would be the isle of *Orce*.

The word Orkney is used for the whole group of islands.

"In the isles of Orchades or *Orkeney*, as we now call them, the Gottish or Danish speech is altogether in vse." (Harr. Descr. of Britt. c. 6.)

"We must now change the scene from Zetland to *Orkney*." (W. Scott's *Pirate*, iii. 72.)

Has this use of a noun singular any reference to the old Welsh tradition, that these islands originally formed but one? Or is *ig* a neuter noun, and *Orkney* the representative of an Anglo-Saxon plural?

RAMSGATE.—Asser tells us that the Isle of Thanet was called in the British tongue *Ruim* (Asser de Reb. Gest. Ælfr., p. 7.). The Welsh word *rhym* signifies that which tends out or projects (Owen); and the name seems to have been given to any tract of land that projected so as to form a point or foreland—at least such is the character of Rum on the Argyle coast, and such appears to have been the character of Rom on the coast of Denmark, if we may judge from the shoals which now surround it. Both these islands were originally Welsh localities.

The gaps in the line of cliff which lead down to the sea are called in Kent *gates*, or *sea-gates* (Grose's Prov. Gloss.). Hence Rams-gate means the gate or pass leading into Ruim.

CANTERBURY is a corruption of the Anglo-Saxon *Cantwara byrig*, the forts or strongholds of the *Cantware*—*Cantwara* being the genitive case plural. *Cantware* meant the men of Cant (Kent), as *Wihtware*, the men of Wiht (Wight), and *Lindisware*, the men of Lindis, or North Lincolnshire.

The Welsh *caint* means a plain, or open country (Owen); and it was probably the old Welsh name for the slip of open land lying between the Weald and the Thames. The forest which covered the southern half of this shire is called in the Chronicle *Andred*, and also *Andredes leaga*, the lea* of Andred. According to Owen *andred* signifies an uninhabited district, a weald. It is compounded of the negative prefix *an* and *ted*, a town, a hamlet. It seems therefore probable that our English Kent comprises two Welsh districts, the *Andred*, or uninhabited Woodland, and the *Caint*, or open habitable country lying beside the river.

From *Cantwara* comes the adjective Cantuar-ensis.

WINCHESTER.—The Welsh word *Gwent* (like *Caint*) signifies an open country, a champaign (Owen); and it seems to have been a name given to several districts in this island. The capital of such a district was called by the Romans *Venta*—*Venta Icenorum*, *Venta Belgarum*, *Venta Silurum*, &c. Monmouthshire is still called *Gwent* by the Welsh, and was called *Went* by our English Chroniclers as late as the 16th century. The Welsh name *Gwent* was changed by the Anglo-Saxons into a feminine substantive *Winte*, gen. *Wintan*; and the capital of the Belgic *Went* was called *Wintecaster* (Wint-city, or Winchester), Sax. Chron. A.D. 897, and also *Wintan ceaster* (the city of Winte), Sax. Chron. A.D. 643.

From *Wintan* comes the adjective Winton-ensis.

WORCESTER.—The Welsh race who lived in Worcestershire were called by the Romans *Huicci*; the English, who succeeded them,

* From the way in which *leaga* is generally used in the Saxon Chronicle, there is some reason to believe it was the old Gothic name for the waste or march, which, according to Cæsar, always surrounded the territory of a German tribe.—*Bell. Gall.* iv. 3.

are called by Anglo-Saxon writers *Hwíccas**. This word exemplifies a use of the plural ending not unfrequent in the Anglo-Saxon, and exactly corresponding to a use of the plural ending in the Sanskrit; it may be rendered the *Hwic-men*. Worcester is mentioned late in the Chronicle, and the name is then spelt *Wigera ceaster* (Sax. Chron. A.D. 992). *Wigera* is most probably a corruption of *Hwic-wara*, the gen. plur. of *Hwic-ware*, the men of *Hwic*.

The Welsh *Gwlg* signifies a fortress, and the Breton *Gwlk*, a town. This word may have been the old Welsh name for Worcester, corrupted by the English settlers into *Hwic*.

NETLEY.—The Chronicle mentions Port's descent at Portsmouth A.D. 501, and then commemorates a battle fought by Cerdic and Cynric A.D. 508, in which they slew a "British King, whose name was Natanleod; then after him was the land named Natanleaga as far as Cerdic's ford." The word *Netley* has been generally considered as connected with *Natanleaga*; but the attempt to connect *Natanleaga* with *Natanleod*, has a good deal puzzled our antiquaries.

I believe both *Natanleod* and *Natanleaga* to be compounds. *Leod*, in our Anglo-Saxon poems, means a chief; and if we suppose *Nate* to be a fem. subst. signifying a district, *Natanleod* will mean the Prince of Nate, and *Natanleaga* the lea of Nate.

Now Wilton, the old capital of Wiltshire, lies at the junction of the *Nadder* and the *Wily*. As the Yorkshire river *Nydd* was at one time called *Nyddor* (Harrison, Descr. of Britt. i. 15), so in like manner the Wiltshire *Nadder* may have had a second name *Nadd*, or in Anglo-Saxon *Nate*. If this be granted, the river may have given the name of *Nate* to the capital of Wiltshire, just as the Neath of Glamorganshire conferred its name upon the town by which it flowed—the *Nidum* of the Romans.

The date and locality have made almost all our historians agree that the *Natanleod* of the Chronicle was the celebrated Aurelius Ambrosius. All the accounts we have received of this chief fix him in Wiltshire; and it has even been supposed that Amesbury (the Anglo-Saxon *Ambres byrig*), which is some eight or ten miles distant from Wilton, was named from him.

The passage then in the Chronicle may perhaps admit of the following explanation:—After the slaughter of the Prince of *Nate*, they named the lea, in which he had so often fought them, the lea of *Nate*, just as certain districts open to the incursions of the Scots and Welsh were called the Scotch and Welsh marches. As *Charford* (which all admit to be Cerdic's ford) lies on the very edge of Wiltshire, the boundaries of *Natanleaga* must have been nearly the same as those of Western Hampshire.

Hence it would seem, that many years after their settlement in the island, our ancestors retained in familiar use several Welsh names of districts; that they called Orkney *Orce*, Thanet *Ruim*,

* Anglo-Saxon Gentile Nouns form the genitive in *a* and the dative in *um*, whether they end in *as* or *e*. As these nouns are rarely found, except in the genitive or dative case, it is sometimes difficult to say which of the two endings, *as* or *e*, should be given to the nominative.

the Weald of Kent *Andred*, the country between the North-Downs and the Thames *Cant*, the eastern part of Hampshire *Winte*, Worcester and its dependent district *Hwic*; and perhaps we may add, that they called Wilton and its neighbourhood *Nate*, and the adjoining part of Hampshire *Natanleaga*.

Other Welsh names of districts were retained, but it is now very difficult to explain their meaning. The inhabitants of Bernicia (as the Latinists termed the northern part of ancient Northumberland) are called in the Chronicle *Beorniccas*, that is the men of *Beornic*. *Beornic* is the *Brynaic* of the Welsh poets, and the Welsh word *brynaic* signifies the uplands or highlands (Owen). The Yorkshiremen are also called *Deras*, or men of *Der*. *Der* is clearly the *Dyver* of Aneurin, and the *Deira* of our Latin historians, but I cannot explain its meaning.

4. On the Etymology of the word *Trap-rock*. By H. Wedgwood, Esq.

The name *trap* (*trappa*, Swed. stairs) is said to have been given by Bergmann to certain igneous rocks, in consequence of the peculiar form (resembling a flight of steps) in which they sometimes arranged themselves. The author was inclined to doubt if such a derivation were the true one, suspecting that the first element of a compound so familiar as the word *trap-dike* in English, could not have been borrowed from scientific nomenclature.

It appears from a Paper in the Phil. Trans. for 1719, giving an account of a coal district in Somersetshire, that where the strata are dislocated by a fault, they are said by the miners *to trap up* or *trap down*, accordingly as they are thrown to a higher or lower level. The dike producing such a *trapping* of the strata, would naturally be termed a *trap-dike*; and this is the name actually given to it in the case most likely to catch the attention of geologists, viz. where the intrusive rock is of igneous origin. The word *trap* would easily be applied by those ignorant of miners' phraseology to the same kind of rock when it made its appearance under other circumstances.

When the strata are said to *trap up* or *down*, the idea represented seems to be the sudden change of level in passing from one side of the fault to the other. This agrees with the ordinary meaning of the term, which is used to express anything that acts with a sudden spring or fall. Compare *trap*, *trap-door*, &c.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

JANUARY 27, 1843.

No. 3.

Professor WILSON in the Chair.

The eight last Numbers of the Numismatic Chronicle were laid on the table. Presented by the Numismatic Society.

The Chairman announced to the Meeting that letters had been received from Professors J. Grimm and F. Bopp of Berlin, expressing the interest they felt in the Society, and their intention of aiding by their communications and otherwise, in the attainment of the important objects which the Society had in view.

A paper was then read by Professor Wilson, entitled, "A Notice of European Grammars and Lexicons of the Sanskrit language."

The author thought it might contribute to the fulfilment of an object which was suggested at the General Meeting in May last for the Society's earliest consideration, namely, the ascertainment of the actual condition of philological inquiry, to offer a short notice of those publications which within the last half century have been designed to promote, amongst Europeans, an elementary knowledge of the Sanskrit language. It appeared to him that the suggestion to which he had adverted, and for which the Society was indebted to a highly valued colleague, whose opinions must ever be entitled to attention, could be followed out successfully only by a division of labour. A comprehensive whole, consisting of many parts, appears to demand for its investigation the acquirements of different members of the Society, of whom, while there are many who might feel themselves equal to undertake some one subdivision, there are probably few who would not distrust their ability to grapple with so vast an undertaking as a universal survey of the present state of philological research. Under the impression, therefore, that an object, which was indisputably of no small importance in the outset of the Society's career—the determination of a fixed point from whence to start—the knowledge of what has been done as a necessary preliminary to what remains to be done—could be most readily attained by separate exertion, he had been induced to enter upon a department which he thought might reasonably be assigned to him, and as prefatory to other branches of an investigation into the existing state of Sanskrit philology, he purposed to submit a brief account of those means of acquiring an acquaintance with the language, which we owed to the talents and industry of European scholars. He might take a future opportunity of offering some notice of the grammatical works of native authorities, and of the labours of European writers, in the elucidation of the affinities which connect the Sanskrit with other cultivated forms of speech.

For a considerable period a notion prevailed that the learned amongst the natives of India were obstinately averse to the communication of instruction in their sacred language to foreigners, and

that this was the reason why so many years elapsed before an attempt to acquire it was made by those Europeans, who from one motive or other had sojourned in India. The notion was not altogether unfounded, although the reluctance which no doubt was encountered was less insuperable than was imagined, and originated in a misconception from which the most enlightened native scholars were free. There is nothing in the laws or institutes of the Hindus which authorizes a monopoly of a knowledge of the Sanskrit language by any one caste or order of the people. The only monopoly insisted upon by the Brahmans was that of tuition. They allowed no other caste to teach—they enjoined the military and agricultural castes to learn, even the holy books, the Vedas. They prohibited the Sudra or servile caste from hearing the sacred books, but they permitted even the mixed castes to read and hear the great historical and mythological poems, and consequently never thought of excluding them from a knowledge of the language in which those books are composed. Their monopoly of tuition, which they most rigorously guarded against aggression, was so far disinterested that it brought with it no pecuniary profit. Even to the present day it is considered derogatory to the purity of the Brahmanical character to give instruction for hire, and although in the service of Europeans the scruple is surmounted, teaching Sanskrit to native pupils is very generally gratuitous. The Brahmans had no doubt a design in thus reserving to themselves the seemingly unrequited duties of instruction, but it is not necessary on the present occasion to inquire what their objects were. It is sufficient to have shown that there was no law to prevent them from expounding the mysteries of their sacred tongue to ears profane, and that Europeans, although no doubt regarded as amongst the lowest of castes, might have become familiar with them at an earlier period, had they entertained the wish and adopted the means of obtaining instruction.

It might appear somewhat unaccountable that the Mohammedans of India should have been blended with the Hindus for centuries, and should have paid no attention to the literature of their fellow-subjects, did we not know the disdainful intolerance with which they regard the languages and literature of all nations that profess a different religious faith. The first sovereigns of Delhi would have incurred the imputation of being infidels had they shown any favour to the Pandits; and in truth they were not in much danger of undergoing such a censure, as they were of a rude race, more addicted to arms than to letters, and commonly dependent upon the former for their thrones and their existence. Their conduct and example were ill calculated to win the confidence of the Hindus, and they were no doubt as backward to impart as the Mohammedans were careless to seek for information. The reign of Akber, in the latter half of the sixteenth century, first wrought a change in this state of public feeling. A friendly intercourse was then first established between both classes of the people, and in imitation of the patronage bestowed by the monarch upon Hindu literary men, the nobles of his court condescended to express curiosity concerning the national

literature, and became the scholars of the Brahmans. The rapidity with which the scruples and reluctance of the latter yielded to the sunshine of imperial favour, must have appeared so marvellous to the Mohammedans, that a fable was invented to account for the alteration. It was said that by the command of the king, Sheikh Feizi, the younger brother of Akber's able minister Abulfazl, had been palmed in early life upon the Brahmans as an orphan youth of their own caste, and that he was initiated by them unwittingly into their learning and doctrines. The tale, though still current, is not very probable. Feizi is the reputed and, in part no doubt, real author of various translations from Sanskrit into Persian: other translations were made under his superintendence. His competency to the task, and the assistance which he commanded, may easily be accounted for without having recourse to fiction. The enlightened encouragement and royal munificence of Akber were the keys that unlocked the treasures of Hindu lore. The taste which he introduced survived his reign, and in Dara Shekoh, the unfortunate son of Shah Jehan, he found a worthy successor. The speculative and supplementary portion of the Vedas, the Upanishads, were translated by his order into Persian*. With the accession of Aurangzib the age of Mohammedan bigotry revived, and the Hindus fell back into their defensive attitude of silence and suspicion.

The first European settlers in India were merchants and soldiers, who troubled themselves little about the intellectual products of the country. The missionaries, however, who followed on their track, speedily perceived the necessity of making themselves familiar with the native languages and writings, and diligently applied themselves to the study. Their purposes were not literary, and they did not deem it incumbent upon them to impart any of their discoveries to the European public, although it is not unlikely that the archives of the Propaganda Society at Rome may contain specimens of the early labours of the missionaries of the Roman church. At any rate, it has been recently evidenced by the voluminous compositions in Sanskrit verse upon Christian subjects by members of the Jesuit mission at Madura, discovered at Pondichery not many years ago, and of which an account† was published in the *Researches of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, that some of the members of this mission attained an extraordinary command over the language, and composed in it with an accuracy and an elegance unsurpassed by any later Europeans, and even by modern native scholars. The same proficiency was attained by them in Sanskrit, which they acquired in the vernacular tongues, and which has placed Robert de Nobili and Father Beschi amongst the classics of Tamil literature in the estimation of the natives of the south of India. Indications of this successful study however were few and faint in the west, although they were at length manifested in such meagre compilations as the

* From the Persian a translation into Latin was made by Anquetil du Perron, who published it under the title of *Oupnekhât, seu Theologia Indica*. Paris, 1801. 2 vols. 4to.

† Account of a Discovery of a modern Imitation of the Vedas, by F. Ellis. *Asiatic Researches*, xiv. p. 1.

'Alphabetum Brahmanicum,' and 'Alphabetum Grandonico-Malabaricum,' published at Rome in 1771 and 1772 by the Propaganda Society.

The first systematic attempt to impart a more extended acquaintance with Sanskrit to European students, was the publication by Paulinus a Bartholomeo, a German missionary* of the name of Wesdin, of a short and imperfect grammar of the language, to which he gave the title of 'Siddharubam, seu Grammatica Samscrdamica,' Rome 1790. This was followed by a number of works on the Indian languages, and the mythology and history of the Hindus, in which the information given, although tinted by colouring of local origin, and blended with fictions peculiar to the Peninsula of India, where Paulinus spent fourteen years, is in the main correct, and might have been useful had it not been overwhelmed by an accompanying mass of crude conjecture and misapplied erudition. A more copious and correct grammar was published by Paulinus in 1804, entitled, 'Vyácaranam, seu locupletissima Samscrdamicæ Linguae Institutio.' The original of this was a native grammar, a copy of which had been translated in India by a Danish missionary of the name of Hanxleden, who seems to have been a much better scholar than Paulinus. His papers having come into the possession of the latter, were either published by him as in the present instance, or employed by him for other works, as in the case of the first book of the Lexicon of Amara Sinha, also published by Paulinus with a Latin translation, which he was enabled to execute, it appears, chiefly by the aid of a manuscript Lexicon, Latin and Sanskrit, compiled by Hanxleden, and appended to the Vyácaranam.

This first grammar of the Sanskrit language, being a translation of an original work, is accurate, although not comprehensive. It is printed with Roman letters in all except the first section, in which the Sanskrit words are expressed in the characters of the Tamil alphabet, of very indifferent typographic execution. The Roman representation of the words in accordance with the original Tamil, is disfigured by corruptions derived from the peculiar pronunciation of the natives of that part of the Peninsula of which Tamil is the vernacular idiom, by whom soft labials are substituted for hard, and soft dentals or semivowels for hard dentals, in certain situations. Thus *Somabá* is written for *Somapá*, and *bhavadi* for *bhavati*, and *nrikshál* for *vrikshát*. With respect also to the Roman orthography, a most barbarous-looking equivalent is not unfrequently given for the original, depending partly upon German and partly upon Italian pronunciation, and which it often requires some consideration to identify; *kashtasrita* is not at once recognisable in *kaszdaschrida*. The grammar is followed by two vocabularies, one Latin and Sanskrit, arranged according to the analogous senses of the words; the other Sanskrit and Latin, arranged alphabetically. It is not stated by whom they were compiled, but it is probable that both were the work of Hanxleden. The 'Vyácarana' is not without merit, and opened the way to the study of Sanskrit by the scholars of the con-

* See a biographical notice of Paulinus in the *Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques*, par M. Abel Remusat, vol. ii. p. 305.

continent; and Paulinus by its publication established a claim to grateful commemoration, although he cannot be considered to have done more than rendered the labours of a brother missionary accessible to the European public*.

Although not yet known in Europe, the labours of our own countrymen in the East, for the dissemination of an accurate knowledge of the Sanskrit language, had preceded the publication of the Vyākaraṇa. The encouragement given to oriental studies by Warren Hastings, the institution of the Asiatic Society by Sir William Jones, and the foundation of the College of Fort William by the Marquis Wellesley, had communicated a powerful impulse and a right direction to the exertions of European scholars in India. Philology could not fail to receive the attention it deserved, and the Asiatic researches were at an early period enriched by the observations of Sir William Jones and Mr. Colebrooke, on various points regarding the structure and nature of the Sanskrit language. The compilation of elementary works expressly for the use of English students, was necessarily one of the first objects of the institution of the College, and it was for the benefit of the junior civil servants of the East India Company attached to the College, that the two first published English grammars of the Sanskrit language, those of Dr. Carey and Mr. Colebrooke, were compiled and printed in Serampore and Calcutta.

Dr. William Carey was a member of the Baptist mission in Bengal. After a residence of eight years in the country, during which he had studied with unwearied assiduity the Bengali and Sanskrit languages, he was appointed Professor of both in the College of Fort William early in 1801. He immediately set about compiling a grammar†, and the first part of this work was published in 1803‡. It was completed in 1806. It forms an immense volume, extending to a thousand quarto pages. This is in great part ascribable to the size of the Sanskrit types employed, which, in the first stages of Sanskrit printing in India, were of unnecessarily gigantic dimensions. With a due allowance on this account, enough remains to constitute the grammar a singular monument of industrious application. The work is divided into five books. The first explains the forms and powers of the letters of the alphabet, and then treats of what is termed in original grammars *Sandhi*, or combination; a series of rules providing for the coalescence or modification of letters when they come into junction or juxtaposition, so as to avoid harshness or hiatus in their articulation; a subject more minutely investigated and more systematically regulated in Sanskrit than in the grammar of any other language. The second book is appropriated to what native grammarians designate *Sabda*, literally a sound, or as here understood, an articulate sound, a word; under which head are comprised declinable words, whether substantives, adjectives, or pronouns;

* Schlegel questions his fully understanding the writings of Hanxleden: "der Pater Paulinus theilte mit was er nur sehr unvollkommen verstand." *Indische Bibliothek*, I. 1. 9.

† Letter to Dr. Ryland, June 15, 1801. *Memoir of Dr. Carey, D.D.*, p. 454.

‡ A Grammar of the Sungskrit language, by William Carey. Serampore, 1806. Reviewed, *Quarterly Review*, vol. i.

and indeclinable words, adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions. The third book treats of the *Dhatus* or roots, as capable of verbal inflexion ; first, as simple verbs in the ten classes or conjugations under which they are arranged in original works ; and secondly, as derivative verbs, causals, desideratives, and frequentatives. The fourth book of ' Carey's Grammar ' describes the formation of derivative words and of compound nouns, and treats of the genders of nouns. The fifth book comprehends the syntax and a few pages of exercises. To the whole is added, by way of an appendix, an alphabetical list of roots.

The Sanskrit Grammar of Dr. Carey is modelled upon the plan of the native grammars, and for the most part follows a similar order. The native authorities also are those chiefly current in Bengal, and he was assisted in the compilation by Bengali Pandits ; he therefore speaks their language and adopts their technical phraseology to an extent that is not a little embarrassing to a mere European scholar. It is also inconveniently troublesome in use to a beginner, especially from the separation which it admits between the rules and the examples, so that many pages invariably intervene before the application of the precept, by which alone its purport is rendered intelligible, occurs. Numerical references from the examples to the rules are inserted, it is true, at the foot of the page in which the former are met with, but the verification imposes extra trouble upon the student, and is likely to be carelessly made : the want of a definite impression in the first aspect of a rule is seldom subsequently supplied. The section which treats of the formation of derivative words is broken up into unnecessarily multiplied subdivisions, which, with an appearance of classification, only render the subject more complicated and reference more uncertain. The exemplifications of the syntax are meagre and uninteresting. On the other hand, the chapters on conjugation are very copious and instructive, affording examples of a number of the most useful verbs in more or less detail. There are some inaccuracies, but they are not of a nature or extent to detract materially from the usefulness of an ample exhibition of conjugational varieties, as the conjugation of the verbs is the only real difficulty in Sanskrit grammar. The list of roots is a very serviceable and important addition. The whole is provided with a comprehensive index. The ' Grammar ' is in truth a compilation of very great merit, although, from its adhering so closely to native technicalities, it cannot ever be of much advantage to European students. To scholars more advanced it is calculated to be of frequent service, and to any one who should propose to make himself acquainted with an original grammar of the Bengal School it would prove an invaluable auxiliary.

Shortly prior to the publication of Dr. Carey's complete Grammar, appeared the first part of a grammar, compiled by the late Henry Thomas Colebrooke, a member of the Civil Service of Bengal, who, throughout a long and active public life in India, in the course of which he ascended to the highest distinctions of the service, cultivated the language and literature of the Hindus with singular ability, untiring diligence, and unrivalled success. Succeeding to the posi-

tion occupied by Sir William Jones, he proved himself worthy to be his successor, as, if he brought with him to the study an inferior order of scholastic attainments, and a less poetical imagination, he surpassed that distinguished orientalist in the profundity and exactitude with which he accomplished all he attempted, and for which he was indebted to a severer turn of thought and a predilection for scientific and mathematical investigation. At the time at which the College of Fort William was established, Mr. Colebrooke held the important office of one of the Judges of the High Court of Appeal of Bengal, but the interest which he felt in the institution induced him to allow himself to be named as Professor of Hindu Law and the Sanskrit Language, and he acted for some time as Examiner in the Persian, Hindustani, Bengali, and Sanskrit Languages. From his connexion with the College originated the grammar now noticed, which was published in 1805.

Mr. Colebrooke's 'Sanskrit Grammar' forms a small folio volume, extended beyond its due proportion by the same circumstance which magnified the bulk of Dr. Carey's work—the unnecessary size of the Devanagari types. The general arrangement is much the same as that of Dr. Carey, being regulated by the nature of the subjects explained. There are many essential varieties however in the details. The letters, their several powers, and the changes which they undergo in connexion with each other, are first described. Then follows the declension of nouns. Three chapters succeed, of which one treats of the genders of nouns, one of the formation of the feminine gender, and one of indeclinables. The rest of the work is occupied with the general rules of conjugation, exemplified by a rich collection of the Paradigms, in more or less detail, of all the verbs of the first conjugation, as derived from the best standard authorities, whose variations are carefully pointed out in accompanying annotations. No further portion of the grammar was ever published, Mr. Colebrooke considering that, after other entire grammars had been provided, it was not necessary to finish his own work, and his time and interest being engaged in other occupations and inquiries. The only materials which he seems to have collected were the remaining conjugations of the simple verbs, of which he gave the author a manuscript copy. The Paradigms were less fully developed than they would have been if they had been designed for publication. The subjects of derivation, composition and syntax were untouched, much to the regret of all those who are familiar with Mr. Colebrooke's labours in various departments of Hindu literature and science.

The grammar of Mr. Colebrooke, like that of Dr. Carey, is based upon the writings of Hindu grammarians. He has followed however the authorities of a different school, that of which Benares is considered to be the high seat, and which in its origin is more ancient than the school of Bengal. He has consequently adopted their terminology in the technicalities which he employs and the precepts which he enunciates, but he has arranged the rules according to a classification of his own. The technical language of his rules, as of those of Carey's grammar, is startling and perplexing to a European

student, and almost incomprehensible without the aid of an interpreter. The difficulty here also is enhanced by the want of contiguous examples, by which the rules may be at once illustrated and rendered intelligible. The examples are in a different and sometimes in a distant part of the volume, and although references are sometimes specified numerically, yet they are not always inserted, and are never of ready applicability from the nature of the divisions into books, chapters and sections. Thus, as an example both of the phraseology and of the separation of rule and illustration, let us take the following—it is one out of some hundreds. Section 7. chapter iv. of Book I. treats of the permutations of finals. Rule I. runs thus:—“A blank (*lopa*) is substituted for *n* final of a crude noun that is denominated *pada*, except the vocative singular, unless in the neuter gender.” Now here we have first the theoretical peculiarity that a letter is said not to be elided or expunged, but a blank is said to be substituted for it; and secondly, the use of the term *pada*, by which is meant the crude noun before all inflexional terminations beginning with a consonant, exclusive of those of the nominative case in the three numbers, and of the accusative singular and dual, and also before affixes forming derivatives, and before other nouns forming compounds. The first application of this rule occurs after an interval of forty pages, under the declension of nouns ending in *n*, as *rājan*, a king, which loses its final *n*, agreeably to the precept, before the inflexional terminations beginning with consonants, as *rajabhis*, by kings; *rajasu*, in or amongst kings; but keeps it in the vocative, as *rajan*, oh king. The other applications do not occur in the volume at all, as the work does not comprehend the construction of derivatives and compounds, in which the final of *rājan* is equally lost, as *rājya* and *rājatva*, royalty; *rāja-dherma*, the duty of a king. Had these exemplifications been attached to the rule, the obscurity would have been dissipated, and a definite and permanent impression of a very extensively useful precept would have been effected. Where, however, familiarity with the arrangement and with the phraseology is acquired, Mr. Colebrooke’s grammar becomes of inestimable value from its extreme precision and remarkable comprehensiveness. The rules provide most accurately, and in the shortest possible space, for every contingency of inflexion, whether of nouns or verbs.

Although not exactly in the order of publication, yet it will be convenient, whilst yet in the regions of the East, to notice two other productions of the Calcutta press upon the subject of Sanskrit grammar. The first of these was as early in point of compilation as either of its predecessors, having been prepared in 1804. The author, Mr. Forster, declares however, that subsequently to the appearance of the grammars of Carey and Colebrooke, he was so sensible of the inferiority of his own that he had allowed it to slumber longer in the press than was necessary, with a view to its eventual suppression. Mr. Forster was also a member of the Civil Service of Bengal, and was a distinguished Bengali scholar. He was a man of a vigorous and active mind, but without Mr. Colebrooke’s scholarship and perspicacity, and of a more mechanical than even

methodical turn. His work is entitled, 'An Essay on the Principles of Sanskrit Grammar*,' and is illustrative of the author's peculiarities, displaying great labour and considerable ingenuity. It is, to a great extent, an attempt to give a tabular form to Sanskrit grammar, the exemplifications of the rules for the permutation of letters, the inflexions of declension and conjugation, and the development of derivative verbs and nouns, being collected in tables to which the rules refer. The construction of these tables, the relations that some of them bear to others, and the connexion between them and the rules they exemplify, are not always happily contrived, and the complex and troublesome system of the references from the rules to the tables, and from one table to another, renders the work wholly unavailable for elementary study. It contains however a vast number of useful specifications, and may be occasionally consulted with benefit by riper students. The work, as far as printed, comprises the usual divisions of the grammar; but it was the intention of the author to have given a second volume, in which he was to have inserted a translation of the 'Mugdhabodha,' the native grammar, which is the standard authority in Bengal, and which is ascribed to Vopadeva, a grammarian of the twelfth century†.

The other Sanskrit grammar published in Calcutta is of comparatively recent date. It is the work of Mr. Yates, a member of the Baptist mission, a body which for its number has furnished a greater proportion of first-rate Sanskrit and Bengali scholars than any other class of persons in Bengal. Mr. Yates's grammar is constructed upon the plan of popular European grammars, with a view to the simplification of the system and abridgement of time and labour in the acquirement. He has not altogether failed in his object, although it may be doubted if the principles of popular vernacular grammar be applicable to so copious and complicated a language as Sanskrit‡. Mr. Yates's grammar forms a moderately sized octavo volume, and may be consulted with facility. It does not seem to have made much way in Europe, its necessity having been superseded by similar productions in this part of the world. At no time however, not even at the present, do any of the publications of the Anglo-Indian press penetrate through what may be termed, to use an Indian illustration, the bound-hedge of English literature.

When the Asiatic Society of Calcutta was first instituted, and for a few years following, the inquiries of our countrymen into the languages and literature of India seem to have excited some attention and interest. Much of this was owing to the European reputation of Sir William Jones, acquired in an English university, and maintained by his correspondence on oriental subjects with the most eminent of the continental orientologists. The novelty of the objects investigated, and the attractive though erroneous tendency of some of the Society's fancied verifications of ancient mythology and scrip-

* 1 vol. 4to, Calcutta, 1810. Reviewed by Bopp in the 'Heidelberg Jahrbucher, 1818,' No. xxx.

† There is, in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, a neatly written copy of Mr. Forster's essay, including, it is believed, the materials of the second portion of his work.

‡ Indische Bib., vol. ii. p. 11.

tural history, contributed also to awaken and to keep interest alive. The public mind was also then at leisure to receive new impressions, as little of novelty or importance in literature was offered for its amusement or instruction about the period when the first volume of the 'Asiatic Researches' appeared, or in 1788. In a very brief time, however, came the all-absorbing interest of the momentous events springing from the revolution in France, and when literature revived it assumed a more inviting form than archæological conjecture, or philological speculation, busying itself with a distant people and remote antiquity. It is not surprising therefore that no note was taken of the grammatical labours of Englishmen residing in the East, and that they found their way slowly and with difficulty even to the few who stood in need of their aid and longed for their appearance. A striking instance of this occurs in the case of the late Professor Chezy, who until 1810 had not heard of the existence of Carey's 'Sanskrit Grammar.' In the preface to his excellent edition and translation of 'Sakuntala' he has described, in an animated and interesting tone, the wretched means and the unremitting application by which he acquired his first knowledge of Sanskrit, and the delight with which he welcomed the bulky volume of Carey, and the more elegant and available grammar of Wilkins, which had been published in London at the end of 1808*.

The publication of the grammar of the late Sir Charles Wilkins constitutes an important era in the annals of Sanskrit philology. Its European origin and complexion, its distinct and elegant typography, and the higher merits of method and perspicuity, recommended its contents to the notice of continental scholars, and tempted as well as enabled them to embark in a study from which they had previously been repelled by the uncouth form and inadequate structure of the vessels provided for their conveyance. From the appearance of the grammar of Wilkins may be dated the impulse given to the cultivation of Sanskrit, and, as an obvious consequence, of comparative philology, both in France and Germany, and the somewhat tardy, though it is to be hoped not unpromising emulation which the labours of the philologists of the continent have at length aroused amongst ourselves.

Sir Charles Wilkins, like Colebrooke and Forster, reflects lustre upon the civil service of Bengal. Stimulated and encouraged by the example of Mr. Halhed, also a Bengal civilian,—the first Englishman who directed his attention to Sanskrit—although better known by his grammar of the Bengali language, Mr. Wilkins engaged about the year 1778 with ardour in the study, and, in despite of the absence of all elementary assistance, soon became profoundly acquainted with the structure of the language, and with its standard literature. An undeniable proof of the success which had rewarded his diligence was manifested in 1784 by the publication of his translation of the

* "La bibliothèque du roi possédait bien à la vérité un essai informe du grammaire, un manuscrit composé à ce que, je crois, par quelque Missionnaire Portugais, mais ne renfermant que le paradigme du verbe substantif, le tableau de déclinaisons, une partie du vocabulaire d'Amera et une liste des dhatous; le tout fourmillant d'erreurs les plus grossières."

philosophical episode from the 'Mahábhárata,' the 'Bhagavad Gita,' which was printed in London under the patronage of the Court of Directors, at the recommendation of the most illustrious Governor-general that British India ever obeyed, Warren Hastings. The difficulty of acquiring the knowledge of a difficult language, such as Sanskrit, without any other appliances and means than grammars and lexicons in the language itself, and preceptors ignorant of English, and unfamiliar with our notions of elementary tuition, can be conceived by none but those who have been placed in similar circumstances. Fortunately the author's experience of the difficulty was brief, for had not the grammar of Sir C. Wilkins come to his rescue, whilst guessing at the obscurities of the 'Mugdhabodha' through the equally puzzling interpretation of a Pandit, he would probably have relinquished the task in despair. Such as it was, the experiment qualified him to do justice to the perseverance and industry by which his precursors in the path have enabled others to follow their route. Upon the return of Mr. Wilkins to England, he brought with him translations of three popular native grammars, and from these, and other original authorities, he compiled a grammar, of which the first pages were printed, in 1795. The types of the 'Devanagari' letters employed were cut and cast under his personal direction; and for the more accurate execution of the work he set up a printing press in his own house. When his preparations were complete, and, as stated, the first pages of the grammar were printed, the house was set on fire; the manuscript books, matrices and punches were saved, but the types and press were destroyed, and the prosecution of the work was stopped. So many causes of delay retarded its resumption, that Mr. Wilkins at last had determined to abandon his design, when the establishment of the East India College at Haileybury supplied him with a sufficient inducement to renew and complete his labours. The grammar was accordingly finished, and was published towards the close of 1808.

The general plan of Wilkins's grammar is, like that of his predecessors, suggested by the arrangement of native grammarians. To the alphabet and laws of Sandhi succeed the declension of nouns in the order of their final letters, and then the declension of pronouns. The conjugation of verbs, simple and derivative, follows, and then the formation of participles and analogous nouns. The remaining chapters treat of the formation of miscellaneous derivative nouns, of indeclinable words, of the construction of compounds, and of the genders of nouns, and the work ends with the syntax.

The main objects which Mr. Wilkins professes to have had in view in the classification of his grammar and the enunciation of its precepts, are perspicuity and correctness, and it must be admitted that, with some few exceptions of comparatively trivial importance, he has accomplished both. The principal defects of the grammar are an insufficient provision of general principles, and in some respects an inconvenient classification. The examples are numerous, and for the most part well selected, but the rules which they exemplify do not adequately define existing analogies of construction, a knowledge of which is essential to reduce, connect and simplify

what in its present state appears as a somewhat unwieldy and unretainable mass of incoherent details. An unnecessary multiplication of declensions is one consequence of this want of a connecting principle. In the conjugation of the verbs the separation of the four tenses, to which the analogy of conjugational modification is restricted, from the other six tenses, which according to the author are common to all conjugations, scatters the component members of an individual body over a number of pages, so as to render it a matter of extreme difficulty, and to a beginner almost an impossibility, to trace and reunite them so as to form an entire verb. It is to be remarked, as a consequence of this plan, that the whole grammar does not furnish a solitary example of an entire verb inflected throughout in its various moods, tenses, and persons, an omission that is particularly embarrassing to a beginner. In regard to the indefinite preterite tense, one of the most perplexing parts of conjugation, an attempt has been made to reduce its multiform construction to a fixed number of modes, but not with much success, as no general principle has been laid down, whilst it is very evident that all the essential modifications are resolvable into no more than two, or that this tense comprehends the præter-pluperfect and the aorist past—the inflexions of each of which are diversified upon principles not difficult to be detected. The chapters on the derivation of words are totally devoid of method, and it might be objected to them that the examples are needlessly copious, but that, as no printed dictionary of the language existed when the grammar was published, this copiousness of words was of infinite value, as in some degree supplying the deficiency. Finally, it may be objected to the chapter on syntax, that it is not so ample as could be wished, nor are the illustrations in general interesting or striking; notwithstanding these exceptions, however, the justice of which may possibly be with reason called in question, the grammar of Sir C. Wilkins is undeniably a work of great merit and utility, and must ever be regarded as of standard authority*.

The facilities now afforded by the grammatical works on Sanskrit published in the English language, were immediately and zealously applied by men of the highest literary character upon the continent to the acquirement of a knowledge of the language and literature of the Hindus. The success that attended their diligence was speedily displayed in the publication of various interesting disquisitions, either

* Schlegel thus speaks of it: "Finally, Wilkins has with uncommon clearness and ingenuity reduced, if I may use the expression, the Algebra of Sanskrit grammar to familiar arithmetic. It is true that we miss many things in his book, the absence of which, considering the large scale on which the work is planned, cannot well be excused. His terminology also is not always happily chosen, but nevertheless, as a beginning, the grammar is exceedingly convenient and serviceable."—*Ind. Bib.* Burnouf observes: "Parmi ces ouvrages (the different Anglo-Sanskrit grammars) c'est encore celui de Wilkins qu'on peut consulter avec le plus de fruit, et, quelques reproches que l'on soit en droite de lui adresser, il reste encore comme un beau monument du savoir de la patience de l'auteur."—*Journ. As.* Mai 1825. He quotes also Chezy's opinions, as expressed in the 'Moniteur,' 1810, No. 30, and says, "qu'il n'a pas trop dit quand il parle de l'étonnante perfection qui règne dans ce travail, et quand il ajoute que malgré quelques fautes il n'est pas moins digne de l'admiration et de la reconnaissance des savants."

upon subjects of a general nature, or the structure and affinities of the language, especially by those accomplished scholars, Frederick and Augustus Schlegel, by Professor Chezy of Paris, Bopp of Berlin, and Frank of Munich. Some time, however, elapsed before a complete Sanskrit grammar was attempted.

The first Sanskrit grammar published on the continent, after the publication of Wilkins's grammar in England, and the arrival in Europe of the grammars published in Calcutta, was the work of the late Professor Othmar Frank*, then attached to the University of Wurtzburgh, a scholar of the most extensive erudition, and a critic of the most candid and amiable temperament, but whose judgment was sometimes carried away by that turn for metaphysical speculation which is not uncommon amongst his countrymen. From the cultivation of Persian literature and philosophy he passed with avidity to Sanskrit philology and metaphysics, and in the former department took the lead in the compilation of a grammar for German students. It was written in Latin, and published at Wurtzburgh in 1823. The want of a fount of moveable types compelled the author to have recourse to lithography to represent the Devanagari letters; and as they were not written in the best style, nor always accurately, they are very injurious to the appearance of the volume and inconvenient in use. Professor Frank acknowledged his obligations to the works of Colebrooke and Wilkins, but he had also consulted the original grammars printed in Calcutta, which by this time had reached Europe—the 'Sutras' of Panini, and the 'Siddhānta Kaumudī.' He has however chiefly followed the arrangement of Wilkins, modifying, it may be doubted if judiciously, the order of the declensions, and abridging, but not always improving, the chapters on conjugation and derivation. He is equally deficient in the enunciation of general principles, and his rules are assertions of the bare fact that words assume certain forms, without any attempt to explain how or why. His principal additions consist of tables exhibiting the inflexional changes of nouns and verbs in a convenient and readily-consultable manner. The table of conjugations however limits the paradigms of nine out of the ten classes of verbs to the persons of the present tense of the indicative mood, and is of proportionably restricted usefulness. This part of the grammar is open to the objection made to that of Wilkins, that the tenses are distributed in various places, accordingly as they are formed, with what Prof. Frank denominates primary or secondary inflexions†, and that no example is given in the whole grammar of an entire verb. Prof. Frank has taken some pains to explain the meaning of the principal grammatical terms used by native grammarians, derived chiefly from Carey. He has also attempted to build upon the doctrines of the original authorities a theory of the language generally, and of the analogous construction and offices of the different parts of speech, but he has not developed his views in sufficient detail, or with sufficient distinctness, to admit of their being fully comprehended; and it may be doubted, as he has not specified his authorities, whether

* "Grammatica Sanskrita: edidit Othmarus Frank."

† "Flexus primi:" "F. secundarii."

the original grammarians have anywhere suggested, what he imagines he discovers in them, a typical genius of the language, or its relation to the distinctions of matter and spirit. Speculations of this nature were favourite themes with Prof. Frank, and have sometimes perhaps impaired the beneficial results of his unquestionable abilities, industry, and learning.

The grammar by which German scholars have been chiefly introduced to the acquirement of Sanskrit in their several universities, is that of Prof. Bopp of Berlin. This, which was originally written in German*, was published in parts at the several dates of 1824, 1825, and 1827. The Professor's own Latin version† of the more considerable portion was published in 1829, and the remainder, with some emendations and improvements, in 1832. The grammar was again published in an abridged and amended form in 1834. This last edition is, like the first, in German.

The first German edition, and the first part of the Latin version, were founded, the author states, upon the grammars of Wilkins and Forster; and he expresses his opinion that the structure of the language may be more fully developed from the materials which they furnish than from any advantage or assistance derivable from the study of the native Sanskrit grammarians. This avowed depreciation of the authorities on which the works that served Prof. Bopp as guides were declaredly based‡, contrasted with the title he had given to his own work of 'A Critical Grammar,' has exposed him to some rather severe animadversion on the part of his countrymen; one good effect of which, however, was to induce Prof. Bopp to direct his attention to the original grammar of Panini at least, and to enrich the second portion of his Latin version, and the second German edition of his work, with many important observations derived from that source. It may be doubted, however, if the prejudice which he seems to have early contracted against native grammarians has not been injurious to the comprehensiveness of his views and the perspicuity of his arrangement.

Although entitled an abridgement, the last German edition of Prof. Bopp's 'Grammar' can scarcely be regarded as an abbreviation, except typographically. It is printed in a smaller type and more compact shape, but it contains much additional matter, and the differences which it exhibits are rather alterations than omissions or curtailments. The grammar has, in fact, been remodelled in many important respects, and so materially improved, that it may be considered to have superseded the earlier editions;—as it also presents the author's latest conclusions upon the subject, it will be sufficient to confine our attention to a brief notice of this particular publication.

* "Ausführliches Lehrgebäude der Sanskrit Sprache."

† "Grammatica Critica Linguae Sanskritae."

‡ "Cum grammaticam hanc conscribere instituerem, magnaue viderem Wilkinsii et Forsteri de lingua Sanskrita merita, facile intellexi, has litteras non tam accuratiori et copiosiori Grammaticorum indigenarum studio augeri et adjuvari posse, quam libera adhibita critica arte, quæ rationem et leges, quibus lingua in formationibus suis sit usa, examinare et explicare studeat."

The general arrangement of Bopp's 'Grammar' conforms to that of Wilkins's, but differs in some of the details. To the account of the alphabet succeed the rules of literal combination, or *Sandhi*, or as they are termed of Euphony. Under this head, however, Bopp has included changes not simply euphonic, nor properly comprised within the limits of combination as proposed by the original grammarians. The terms *Sandhi* or *Sanhita*, which are applied to this portion of grammar, both denote a holding together, a coalescence or combination, which can, of course, alone take place between two or more letters when they are in contact or contiguity. The object proposed by such laws of combination, is to avoid any harshness or hiatus occasioned by the actual or proximate concurrence of incongruous sounds. Prof. Bopp has extended his rules to changes which occur in single letters in the middle of words, having no regard whatever to the sounds by which they are preceded or followed, but dependent upon inflexional provisions, upon laws affecting declension and conjugation. How far these are to be treated as merely euphonic changes may admit of question, but most assuredly they are not changes resulting from the contact or contiguity of incongruous letters, and are so far inconsistently included under the denomination *Sandhi*. It may be convenient to bring these literal changes together under one head, and anticipate in some degree the laws of inflexion; but on the other hand, it confounds things essentially different, and is a departure from the precision and simplicity of the original system.

Some remarks on the character of Sanskrit roots, and the prepositions with which they combine to form compound verbs, precede the chapters on declension. In the earlier editions, Prof. Bopp, after specifying the general principles upon which nouns were inflected, classed them under six declensions, but in the last edition he has reduced these to one, to which he has subjoined a long series of what he designates as irregular nouns, classing them in the order of the declensions of Wilkins according to their final letters. The reduction of all nouns to one declension is perfectly consistent with the doctrines of the native grammarians and with their scheme of terminations, which is more or less applicable to every case of nominal inflexion. It may be doubted, however, if the irregular nouns of Bopp can be always regarded as deviations from the rule, and their being given separately prevents their analogy of construction, mutually or universally, from being so evident as it might be. There are two principal sources of varieties in inflexion, changes of those letters or syllables which are subjoined to the inflective word or base to express cases or persons, and changes of the inflective word or base itself. The former constitute the essence of declension, and there is little irregularity in them. The changes of the base are peculiar either to individuals or to classes of nouns, but in the latter are founded on common principles, and these can scarcely be denominated irregularities. Prof. Bopp has not thought it necessary to advert to this distinction, attaching little or no importance to the scheme of terminations given in original grammars; he has looked to the inflected noun, not in its elements, but as a whole, and has considered any

special modifications which it may undergo as deviations from general rules. This method is, no doubt, more conformable to European notions, but it appears to be less simple and less easy of recollection than that of the original authorities.

The declensions of adjectives, numerals and pronouns follow those of substantive nouns, and useful tables are inserted in all the editions exhibiting the forms of various nouns in their several cases, in a convenient and serviceable manner.

The subject of conjugation is next treated of. More importance is here attached to the technical inflexional terminations of the original system than was assigned to those of declension. It may be questioned however if even in this instance the terminations are sufficiently prominent. There is also a departure from the technical scheme even as represented by Wilkins, in omitting without remark the indicatory letters of the terminations, that is, certain letters added to the actual termination which are not used to construct the inflexions, but which denote certain invariable modifications of the base to which the inflexional terminations are attached. Thus the terminations of the three persons singular of the present tense are called by Bopp *mi*, *si*, *ti*; in original works they are *mip*, *sip*, *tip*. The *p* is indicatory, signifying that, for the radical vowel of the base, a Guna letter or diphthong is to be substituted, which substitution does not take place before the terminations of the dual *vas*, *thas*, *tas*, or of the plural *mas*, *tha*, *anti*. It is true that this is an instance of what Schlegel calls the Algebra of Sanskrit grammar, and the use of such indicatory letters is purely technical and arbitrary. But what else than technical and arbitrary are significant words when they are employed in a specific and conventional acceptance? Instead of the Sanskrit sign *प*, the presence of which requires a definite change, and the absence of which prohibits that change, Prof. Bopp is obliged to propose different words for the two contingencies, and to give to those words significations which they do not naturally bear, in order to apply them to the object in view, and which senses are in this application of the words merely conventional. Those personal terminations before which the vowel of the base may be changed he calls light—*leichte*—*leves*; those before which it is unchanged he terms heavy—*schwere*—*graves*. It is obvious that these terms can convey, *à priori*, a no more precise notion of the influence exercised by the terminations upon the base than any given letter or syllable. Until explained, their purport is unintelligible, and they have this disadvantage, that when explained their fitness is liable to be disputed. What is the meaning of a light or heavy syllable? Why is *mi* lighter than *mas*, *ti* than *tha*? The single indicatory letter, the algebraic sign, has its conventional significance and no other, and its intention being once defined, it cannot be mistaken or misapplied. However unphilosophical therefore it may be thought, the short-hand of the Sanskrit grammarians has in these respects a decided advantage over the proposed designations. It has its own office and no other.

In the classification he first adopted, Prof. Bopp distributed the verbs amongst four conjugations. In his last work he reduces the

number to two, which is an improvement. He follows however, in regard to the tenses, the same course as Wilkins, dividing the four conjugationals, which he calls special, from the other six, which he terms general. The rules which he prescribes for the structure of the former under their several classes or conjugations, are illustrated by comparatively few examples, but he has added useful tables of the personal terminations of both orders of tenses, so that the construction of a complete verb may be effected with comparative facility. It is however in this part of Sanskrit grammar that the only serious difficulty lies. The peculiarities in the modifications of verbal bases, not of the terminations, are so numerous and anomalous, that when they are scattered over a wide space, and are to be picked up piece-meal, they are very apt to elude the search, and slip from the recollection of the student. It seems preferable therefore to adopt the arrangement observed by Mr. Colebrooke with regard to the first class of verbs, and give examples of all those most frequently recurring, in paradigms, more or less copious, according to the circumstances of each verb. The peculiarities of every verb are thus brought together under their common original, and that may be readily remembered as a whole which can scarcely be acquired by the separate contemplation of its *disjecta membra*. Prof. Bopp seems to have felt this difficulty, and in order to enable the student of his Grammar to advert more promptly to an anomalous construction in various instances, he has added to the conjugations an alphabetical list of what he terms irregular verbs, with numerical references to the paragraph in which the irregularity is described. The cases may be thus more easily referred to, no doubt, but such reference implies previous knowledge of the irregularity. The reader must know, for instance, that the verb *Anja* does offer an anomaly, before he attempts to find what that anomaly may be. In fact, he must have already learnt, although he may have forgotten it, and the index is therefore only a supplement to the recollection. Upon the whole, although it cannot be denied that Prof. Bopp's treatment of this branch of his subject is much more satisfactory than that of his predecessors, Mr. Colebrooke excepted, it leaves much to be desired.

As a specimen of Prof. Bopp's mode of dealing with the conjugation of Sanskrit verbs, the following view which he takes of the personal inflexions may be cited.

1. "The characteristic signs of the persons are the following:—The first person has in the singular and plural *m*, and in the dual *v*, the connection of which, with the essential elements of the first personal pronoun, or *m* in different cases of the singular, and *v* in the nominatives of the dual and plural numbers, as explained in a preceding passage, is very obvious. In the imperative singular of the active voice the first person substitutes *n* for *m*, and the deponent voice drops the consonant in all the persons of the singular number, so that *má* becomes *e*; *ma* becomes *a*; *mi*, *i* and *ai* are substituted for *mai* or *nai*. The syllable *as* in the plural ending *mas*, is, I doubt not, identical with the termination of the plural nominative of *as*, so that the personal endings of the verb correspond as to their purport to the nominatives of nouns. The termination *mas* is therefore to be

resolved into *m* and *as*, and the latter appears also in the terminations of the first person dual *vas*, as *ad-vas*, we two eat.

“The dual termination of the nominatives of nouns, or *au*, is derived from *as*, of which it is merely an emphatic amplification. (Comp. Gr. § 206.) The abbreviated terminations *ma*, *va*, in the subordinate tenses, are dependent upon the unabridged terminations *mas*, *vas*, as neuters on masculines and feminines. (Ibid. § 231.) As neuter, and in fact dualistic, the dual endings of the middle voice *áthe*, *áte*, are in my opinion to be considered as agreeing with the nominative dual of regular neuter nouns, the primitive of which ends in *a*. So *te* from *áte* is identical with the isolated pronoun *te*, they or those two, formed from *ta* with the affix *í*. Also *te* and *the* agree with the masculine nominatives plural of the pronouns through the analogies comprehended in rule 243–4.

2. “The second person has, through all varieties of number and tense, these characteristic elements, *t*, *th*, *dhv*, *dh*, *h*, *sv*, *s*, of which the last is the widest deviation from the pronominal primitives *tva*, *tve*, subordinate from *te* (in like manner as *sv* is formed out of *rv*, and *si* third person out of *ri*); the closest analogy to the pronoun being *dhve*, *dhvam*, of the Atmanepada, the *v* of which, again, in the second person of the imperative singular is connected with *s*, as *sva*. *S* in truth predominates in the singular, as *tudasi*, thou tormentest; *atudas*, thou hast tormented, &c. *Th* and *dh* are common substitutions for *t*, as *prathama* for *pra-tama*, the first; *adh-ara* for *a-tara*, lower; and *adhama* for *a-tama*, lowest: as further exemplifications of these in the second person take the following. From *tud*, active voice, second preterite, second person singular, *tutoditha*; present, second person dual, *tudathas*; plural, *tudatha*; middle voice, present, second person plural, *tudadhve*; imperfect, second person singular, *tudasva*. *Ad* in the second person singular imperative makes *ad-dhi*. The transition of *as* into the dual ending *thas*, and *as* in the third person into *tas*, depends upon the same principle as the formation of *mas* and *vas* in the first person of the plural and dual numbers, that is, it is the annexation of the plural termination of the nominative case of nouns to the especial sign of the third personal pronoun, as they were of the same termination to the signs of the first and second personal pronouns *m* and *v*.

3. “The third person has, in the three numbers in both voices where the terminations undergo no contraction, the letter *t* for its characteristic element, the conformity of which with the pronominal *t*, is as open as day. The development of *ám* in the dual of the potential, &c., we elucidate through the principle of *ávám*, we two; *yu-vám*, ye two; as also in the second and third persons of the Atmanepada, the endings *áthám* and *átám*.”

The chapters on conjugation in Prof. Bopp's grammar contain some interesting analogies between the Sanskrit and Greek inflexions of the verb, but these belong to the subject of comparative philology. There is also some bold and ingenious theorizing upon the construction of some of the general tenses, such as the two futures and the conditional, which he regards as compounded, not simple tenses; also of the complete development of the substantive verb *as*, *esse*, to be;

which is always considered elsewhere as defective. Some of Prof. Bopp's views are rather startling at first, but they are not therefore to be hastily rejected, and may upon further investigation prove to be well-founded.

Consideration is also due to Bopp's theory of the formation of the infinitive mood, which Sanskrit grammarians always treat as a verbal derivative, indeclinable noun; also to his views of the formation of the indeclinable past participle ending in *twá* and *ya*, and the adverbial participle ending in *am*. All these are regarded by Bopp as the objective or instrumental cases of nouns, of which the other cases are defective or obsolete, although traceable possibly in the ancient Sanskrit of the Vedas, of which he has given some proofs; others may be perhaps discovered when our acquaintance with the texts of the Vedas is more extensive.

After disposing of those derivatives, which are commonly held by us to be parts of a verb, the Grammar proceeds to describe other verbal derivatives, to which, as well as to the preceding, Bopp gives the name of Primitives. To them succeed derivative words formed from nouns, as patronymics, possessives, and the like. In both classes he has adopted an arrangement equally simple and convenient—an alphabetical list of the suffixes employed by native grammarians to construct derivative upon primitive words, illustrated by examples of the words formed upon this principle. In doing this, however, Prof. Bopp has omitted what might by some be considered as the most useful part of the classification. These suffixes, as well as those used in forming the inflexions of declension and conjugation, are composed of two elements, the letter or letters which are really added to or substituted for the original ending of the base, and a letter or letters which are merely indicative of certain changes in the body of the base: the latter Prof. Bopp omits. Thus, in the first part of his Taddhita, or nominal derivatives, he gives the letter *a* as forming patronymics, abstracts, collectives and adjectives from primitive nouns, as *vásishtha*, son of Vasishtha; *sauhrida*, friendship, from *suhrid*, a friend; *kápota*, a flock of pigeons, from *kapota*, a pigeon; *rájata*, silver or silvery, from *rajata*, the metal, silver. In these examples it will be noticed the original short vowel of the base is transmuted to a long vowel or diphthong; it is exchanged, in technical language, for its vridhhi, or augmented substitute. The rule that says such change takes place has to provide for each separate case separately, but in the notation of the original scheme it is a general rule that an indicative nasal of the cerebral class in any suffix whatever denotes the increase or vridhhi of the vowel of the base. Accordingly, the affix is here said to be not *a*, but *añ*, the *ñ* being the indicative, the *a* the essential element; consequently, *añ* being applied to the words particularized, *a* is either added to or substituted for the proper termination of the primitive, the radical vowel of which also undergoes a definite modification. There is another important consideration to recommend the preservation of the indicative letter. The essential letter of a suffix may be the same, but the effect upon the base may be different; in one instance its addition may require, in another prohibit, any change of the

radical vowel; two opposite results proceeding from the same adjunct as it stands in Bopp's scheme. The cause of the difference is at once seen when the indicatory letter is inserted and its influence is known. Derivatives formed with *a* alone may or may not change the vowel of the base, but those formed with *añ* do require the change; those formed with *añ*, or *a*, and the nasal of the guttural class of consonants, never admit it. *Siva* with *añ* makes *saiva*; *chiti* with *añ* makes *chintā*. It would therefore have been of benefit to the student, as furnishing him with a key to similarity and dissimilarity of derivation, if the indicatory had been added to the essential elements in the alphabetical lists of the suffixes.

The chapters on derivation are followed by those on compound nouns and indeclinables; no chapter on syntax is included in either of the editions. The author in the first edition announced his purpose of delaying it until after the publication of the glossary to his edition of *Nalus*. It has not yet however appeared, and no notice is taken of the omission in the last edition. The subject could not fail to derive interesting and important elucidation from Prof. Bopp, although, as he justly observes, Sanskrit syntax may be disposed of in a very moderate compass, as the principles of construction are for the most part conformable to those of general grammar or the grammars of kindred languages, and rarely deviate from the limits prescribed by the nature of its own copious and perfect system of grammatical forms*.

From this brief and necessarily imperfect sketch of the Sanskrit grammar of Prof. Bopp, it will no doubt be evident that he has treated the subject with profound attention, and has given to Sanskrit students a most valuable and instructive work. The last edition is in particular to be recommended as a compendious and comprehensive guide to the study of Sanskrit grammar, and it fully merits the character which was given to the first edition of it by another distinguished German scholar and critic, Prof. Lassen, when, adverting to the authorities which Prof. Bopp professed to have followed, he described it as more systematic than the grammar of Wilkins, more perspicuous than that of Forster, and more concise than either.

But one other grammar remains to be mentioned, concerning which the author can say little, as it is his own. It was published in 1841. Its especial object is to render the acquirement of Sanskrit easy to beginners. How far this is effected remains to be determined. From the remarks which have been hazarded upon some portions of Prof. Bopp's Grammar, it will be readily inferred that the author has made more use than Prof. Bopp has done of the methods of native grammarians, and he has only to hope that he may not thereby have merited the sentence which was pronounced

* "Syntaxin nondum absolvere potui, ne tamen extensum hac de re opus expectent lectores; Sanskrita enim lingua, apud antiquiores imprimis auctores locupletissimæ et perfectissimæ suæ grammaticæ raro transgreditur fines a natura constitutos, ita, ut qui ea repetere noluerit quæ ad generalis grammaticæ pertinent principia, et eodem jure in cujusvis alius ex eadem familia linguæ compendio locum habeant, paucis capitibus absolvat syntaxin Sanskritam."

upon Mr. Colebrooke's Grammar, that "whilst it is of value as an introduction to the study of native grammars, it is insufficient and excessively obscure as a grammar of the language."

Several works connected with the objects of the grammars which have been adverted to, and which are in an especial degree subservient to the acquirement of the Sanskrit language, have been compiled and published by European authors regarding the Sanskrit radicals. Lists of these are attached to Carey's 'Sanskrit Grammar,' and to his 'Bengali Dictionary,' and as identical with verbs they are particularized by Wilkins and Forster. The former also published a separate work, in which the roots are arranged in alphabetical order, with the meaning as expressed in original lists, the translation of the original term, a short sentence illustrative of its use, and the indicatory letters denoting peculiarities of conjugation. The chief defects of this publication are occasional inaccuracies and general poverty of exemplification.

A work of a similar purport, but superior execution, was subsequently published by the late Dr. Rosen, and was characterized by that ability, judgement, and learning which he displayed still more conspicuously in his edition and version of the first part of the 'Rig-veda,' and which have ensured to his too brief career the admiration and regret of all Sanskrit scholars. In this compilation the roots are arranged alphabetically by their final and then their initial letters. Their Sanskrit equivalents, as given by two standard native writers, Kasinath and Vopadeva, are inserted and translated by the Latin infinitive. The classes in which they are conjugated are specified, and short paradigms of the principal tenses are supplied. The most novel and useful feature of the work is the exemplification of the senses of the radicals as they occur in their inflected forms in short but well-chosen passages extracted from the different books which had been printed at the period when the work of Dr. Rosen was compiled. The same plan of illustration is then adapted to another and important novelty, the most useful of the compound verbs, or those in which the inseparable prepositions are prefixed to the radicals, constituting the great body of the verbs that occur in Sanskrit compositions. The examples are referred to the originals whence they are extracted, and are translated into Latin with fidelity and elegance.

A still more elaborate description of Sanskrit radicals has been subsequently published. It was printed at Bonn in 1841, and is the work of Mr. Westergaard, a young but distinguished scholar, whose ardour in the cause of Sanskrit has induced him to repair to India in order to prosecute his studies to still higher proficiency. He has deservedly received for this purpose the patronage of the Danish government. The materials of his list of roots were derived from this country. Mr. Westergaard laboured for some time with most extraordinary diligence in the Library of the East India Company, and drew his information and examples chiefly from the manuscript volumes of the Company's collection. The roots are arranged alphabetically according to their final and initial letters. The class and voice in which each is conjugated are specified, and a paradigm more

or less complete according as authorities warrant the forms, is available. The meanings are then stated and exemplified by citations from published and unpublished texts, and the structure and use of the derivative verbs are also shown and exemplified. To them succeeds the series of compound verbs according to the order of their prefixes, with passages illustrating their application. Reference to the authorities whence the forms and examples are derived is constant and careful. As the examples are very numerous, and as no facilities exist in Sanskrit manuscripts, such as verbal indices, or any similar auxiliars, the labour and research by which they were collected must have been very great and persevering. They are for the most part judiciously selected, but they are not translated, and this is a serious drawback from the value of the compilation; for passages detached from the context of a work not familiarly known and not easily accessible, do not always admit of ready and confident interpretation. It would no doubt have materially augmented Mr. Westergaard's trouble to have given translations of all the passages he has quoted, but it would have proportionably enhanced the usefulness and interest of the compilation if he had followed Dr. Rosen's example in this respect. A translation by himself is also necessary to support his rendering of the purport of a simple or compound verb, and secure its being acquiesced in by others. It is of infinite importance in the early stages of Sanskrit study, that in all books of an elementary character radical words should be rendered by unquestionable and unexceptionable European equivalents. When the native grammarians give the sense of a radical by a word of obvious import, then the European interpreter is tolerably safe, although even here he may be unlucky in his translation, and fail to make use of the most appropriate expression. When, however, he has to deduce the sense of a radical from his own understanding of some of its inflections as they occur in composition, and where usage, licence, or metaphor may have given their own colouring to the primitive signification, it is very possible that the translator may mistake or may be misled as to the sense, and confound a lax or general with a literal and particular meaning. It is true that Mr. Westergaard defines the sense which he ascribes to the verb that he inserts as he understands its use in the example quoted, but then comes the question whether he has understood the passage rightly; the answer to which, although no doubt in most instances affirmative, may sometimes be given with doubt and hesitation.

Of subordinate contributions to the elucidation of Sanskrit grammar, independently of the attempts made to illustrate such original works as have been printed in Europe, or to develop the affinities of the language, the author can offer but a brief and passing intimation. They are scattered through a variety of continental publications on Oriental or general literature, many of which are little known in this country, and of various merits and character, from the Transactions of the Imperial Academy of St. Petersburg to the 'Mercure de France' of Paris. Amongst the richest in articles on Sanskrit philology, not comparative, may be especially noticed a periodical conducted by the illustrious William Augustus von Schlegel,

the 'Indische Bibliothek,' a work which has been discontinued for some years. Its place in Germany has been latterly taken by a periodical of a more comprehensive character, 'Der Zeitschrift für die Kunde der Morgenlandes,' embracing the literature of the East, not of India alone, and conducted by an association of the most eminent German oriental scholars. In the former of these collections may be especially particularized, 1. the observations of Prof. Schlegel himself upon the actual state of Sanskrit philology in 1820*; and 2. a general view of the state of Sanskrit literature in 1824†; 3. a remarkable and most elaborate dissertation on the verbal derivatives formed with the suffixes *Ya* and *Twá*, intended to establish their analogy to the gerunds of the Latin verb by Baron William von Humboldt‡; and 4. a review of Prof. Bopp's Grammar by Prof. Lassen. In the 'Zeitschrift' we have a theory of the formation of compound nouns with the interrogative pronoun by Dr. Nesselmann, and a paper on the substitution of the cerebral for the dental nasal under certain circumstances, by Dr. Boetlingk. There are no doubt communications of like tendency and value in other collections with which I am unacquainted. The 'Journal Asiatique' of the Asiatic Society of Paris is less rich in contributions to Sanskrit philology than to other branches of Asiatic literature.

Less has been attempted in the collateral branch of lexicography than in grammar. The character of native lexicons will be more particularly adverted to on some other occasion. It will be sufficient at present to state that they correspond in their arrangement to vocabularies as we employ the term, rather than to dictionaries, the words being classed in them according to analogy of meaning without regard to alphabetical order. They omit also many words of popular currency, as being too familiar to need explanation, and withhold consequently much that is most wanted by a European student. The best work of the class was selected at an early period for publication and translation by Mr. Colebrooke. The 'Amara Kosha,' or lexicon of Amara Sinha, was printed at Serampore in 1808, accompanied by a marginal translation into English, by illustrations and additions derived from the numerous commentaries on the original text, and by a most useful alphabetical index. A reprint of the text with a French translation at the foot of the page has recently been published at Paris, the work of a young and highly promising Sanskrit scholar, also prematurely lost to the cultivation of Hindu literature, M. Loiseleur des Longchamps.

At the same time that the vocabulary of Amara Sinha was published, a dictionary on a more extended scale, and alphabetically arranged, was compiled, under the instructions of Mr. Colebrooke and the immediate supervision of one of the most celebrated native scholars in Bengal, by a number of Pandits. The main object of this compilation was to bring together the contents of as many of the original Koshas, or vocabularies as were procurable, to arrange them in alphabetical order, and add their etymology, according to grammatical authorities. Soon after its completion the author obtained a copy of this work, and having carefully collated all the

* Vol. i. p. 1.

† Vol. ii. p. 1.

‡ Vol. i. part 4. and vol. ii. part 1.

words with the authorities whence they were taken, incorporated with them the whole of the radicals as well as other words omitted in the compilation, and transferred the etymologies from the Bengali to the Benares terminology. He made a translation of the work, and with the encouragement of the Bengal government published it in 1819. The plan of the original compilation necessarily left many deficiencies. Shortly before he left India, however, he had an opportunity of making more extensive additions, which remedied in some degree the imperfections of the first edition, although no doubt still leaving many accessions to be made. This second edition was published in 1832. Such as it is, this dictionary is the only one yet published; and although no person can be more sensible than the author how far it falls short of such a lexicon as the study of Sanskrit demands, yet he has the satisfaction of knowing that it has materially contributed to the extension of a knowledge of Sanskrit in Europe. Although no other dictionary has been published, its place has in a great measure been supplied by useful glossaries attached to some of the books edited by European scholars, particularly by Prof. Bopp in the glossary to his edition of 'Nalus,' and Prof. Johnson of the East India College in his editions recently published of the 1st Book of the 'Hitopadesa,' 'Selections from the Mahabharata,' and 'Megha Dúta.' Prof. Bopp is also engaged upon a glossary on a large scale, of which the first part only is published. When glossaries of this kind, and when verbal indices to standard works, shall have been sufficiently multiplied, it will then be comparatively easy to compile a Sanskrit dictionary that shall place its compiler on a level with Forcellini or Stephens.

The author has thus endeavoured to bring before the Society a general view of the advance that has been made in the rudimental cultivation of Sanskrit philology; and it will probably be admitted, even from this brief and imperfect notice, that, considering the period within which the study of Sanskrit has been prosecuted by Europeans, the progress has been creditable, and that no lack of intelligence or activity has been displayed in clearing away the impediments by which the first steps of the acquirement were beset. The facilities provided are no doubt far from sufficient; the approach may still be embarrassed by perplexing labyrinths, dark passages and cumbrous obstructions; the first labours of the pioneer must be necessarily rough and incomplete; but the path has been laid open, and it remains for succeeding exertions to smooth, to level, and to embellish it.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

FEBRUARY 10, 1843.

No. 4.

Professor WILSON in the Chair.

The Rev. Richard Garnett presented to the Society, Archbell's Bechuana Grammar, Graham's Town, Cape of Good Hope, 1837; Macbrair's Mandingo Grammar, Lond.; Gospel of St. Matthew in Mandingo. Lond. 1837.

The following candidates were balloted for and duly elected members of the Society:—

John Scott, M.D., 12 Bedford Square.

Thomas J. Clark, Esq., of the Middle Temple, and of Edmonton, Middlesex.

Charles C. Atkinson, Esq., Haverstock Terrace, Hampstead.

Professor Latham then finished his paper "Upon the Languages of the Papuan or Negrito race scattered through the Australian and other Asiatic islands."

By the term Negrito is meant those tribes of the Asiatic and Australian islands, who, in one or more of their physical characters, depart from the type of the nations in their neighbourhood, and approach that of the African. The word is more comprehensive than Arafura, Andaman, or Papuan, and less comprehensive than Negro.

Of the Negrito localities the most western are—

The Andaman Islands.—A Vocabulary, collected by Lieutenant R. H. Colebrooke, appears in the Asiatic Researches, vol. iv. p. 410. The native name is Mincopie. An historical notice of them appears as early as the ninth century, in the Travels of the Two Arabians, translated by Renaudot.

The Nicobar and Carnicobar Islands.—In the largest of these it is stated that, in the interior, blacks are to be found. The current assertion concerning the language of the rest of these islands is, that the Carnicobar is Peguan, and the Nicobar Malay.—Asiatic Researches, iii. 303.

Malacca.—The Samangs of the interior are Negrito. For the single Vocabulary of their language, see Crawfurd's Indian Archipelago, or Klaproth's Nouveau Journal Asiatique, xii. 239, where Crawfurd's Vocabulary is reprinted without acknowledgement. The Orang Benua are *not* Negrito; neither are the Jokong Negrito. For thirty words in the latter language, see Thomas Raffles's Asiatic Researches, xii. 109. In this list twelve words are shown by Raffles to be Malay, and Humboldt states the same of two more. The

other sixteen may or may not be of Negrito origin. The Samangs are the Orang Udai.—Humboldt, *Über die Kawi Sprache*.

Sumatra.—The Battas of Sumatra are Malay, not Negrito (Marsden's *Sumatra*, p. 203, and Rienzi's *Oceanie*, vol. i.). The Sumatran of Parkinson's *Journal* (p. 198) is the Arabic of Acheen. The true Negritos of Sumatra seem to be,

1. The *Orang Cooboo*.—These are stated to be pretty numerous between Palembang and Yambée.—Marsden's *Sumatra*, p. 35.

2. The *Orang Googoo*,—who are described by the Sumatrans of Laboon as being more Orang Utang than man.—Marsden's *Sumatra*, p. 35. Specimens of the Orang Googoo (Gougon) Rienzi states to have seen. He says that they come from Palembang and Menangkaboo, and he calls them Pithecomorphi.

For an historical notice as early as 960 A.D., probably referring to the Blacks of Sumatra, see Klaproth in *Nouveau Journal Asiatique*, xii. 239.

Borneo.—The Biajuk of Borneo is not Negrito but Malay (Crawford's *Indian Archipelago*); neither are the Dyacks Negrito. The statement of Marsden and Leyden is, that the Dyacks are *whiter* than the rest of the natives of Borneo; and the remark of more than one voyager is, that the Dyacks of Borneo look like South-sea Islanders in the midst of a darker population. Are the Marut, Idongs, Tidongs, or Tirungs of the north of Borneo Negrito? In Rienzi's *Oceanie* there is a Borneo Vocabulary which is headed Dyack, Marut and Idaan, the three terms being treated as synonyms: of this Vocabulary all the words are Malay. That there are Negritos in Borneo is most probable, but of their language we possess but one word, *apün*, father* (and that more than doubtful), whilst of their name we know nothing; and in respect to their locality, we have only the statement of Kollf, that in the north of Borneo Blacks are to be found on the Keeneebaloo mountain; a statement, however, slightly modified by the fact of his calling them Idaans or Maruts (see Earl's translation of the *Voyage of the Doorga*, p. 417). Compare the name Idaan in Borneo, with the name Orang Udai (applied to the Samangs) in Malacca.

The Sooloo Islands.—There are positive statements that the Sooloos contain Negritos. They also contain Malays; as may be seen in a Sooloo vocabulary in Rienzi's *Oceanie*, vol. i.

The Manillas.—The Isola de Negros testifies its population by its name. Hervas calls it the Papua of the Philippines. In Panay are the blackest of the Philippine Negritos. Rienzi would term them Melanopygmæi. In Bohol, Leyté, and Samar, there are Negritos (Lafond Lurcy, ii. 182.); also in Cayagan (Lafond Lurcy, ii. 182.); also in Capul or Abac (Hervas). For the two main islands there are,—1st. In Mindanao, two wild tribes inhabiting the interior, the Bantschilen and the Hillunas. The proof of these two tribes being Negrito is the strongest for the Hillunas. They are the Negros del Monte of the Spaniards (Hervas, *Catalogo delle Lingue*; Adelung, i. 601). Near Marivèles are the Igorots or Ætas (Agtas of Hervas);

* Mithr. i. 598.

and of these we have late and positive evidence, first to the fact of their being Negrito, and next to the difference of their language from the Tagal.—Lafond Lurcy. Secondly, in Luçon, the Zam-balen of Adelung are Negrito. These are the Blacks of Pampango. The Blacks inhabiting the other parts of the island are called Ygelots; and Mount St. Matthew, near Manilla, is one of their well-known localities, and the Illoco mountains another. Here they were visited by Lafond Lurcy. They were all alike, and all under four feet six (French measure). Italonon, Calingas, and Maitim, are the names under which the Philippine Blacks have been generally described. Agta and Maitim are said to be indigenous appellations.—Hervas.

Formosa.—The Formosan language is Malay. In the interior, however, are, according to the Chinese accounts,—1, the Thou-fan; 2, the Kia-lao; 3, the Chan tchaó chan; 4, the Lang Khiao,—aboriginal tribes with Negrito characters, each speaking a peculiar dialect.—Klaproth, *Recherches Asiatiques*.

The Loochoo Islands.—The current Loochoo language is Japanese (Klaproth, *Rech. Asiat.*). But besides this, Adelung mentions from Père Gaubil and Gosier, that three other languages are spoken in the interior, neither Japanese nor Chinese; and we are now, perhaps, justified in considering that, in these quarters, the fact of a language being aboriginal, is *primâ facie* evidence of its being Negrito.

Java.—Here the evidence of an aboriginal population at all is equivocal, and that of Negrito aborigines wholly absent. For the Kalangs, see Raffles's *History of Java*. The dark complexions on the island Bali show the darkness, not of the Negrito, but of the Hindoo; such at least is the view of Raffles opposed to that of Adelung (*Mith. i.*). There is no notice of Blacks in Ende (otherwise Floris), in Sumbawa, or in Sandalwood Island.

Savoo.—If the Savoo of modern geographers be the Pulo Sabatu of Dampier, then there were, in Dampier's time, Blacks in Savoo. The Savoo of Parkinson's *Journal* is Malay.

Timor.—In this island Negritos were indicated by Peron. Freycinet describes them. Lafond Lurcy had a Timor black as a slave. Of their language he gives four words:—*manouc*, bird; *vavi*, woman; *lima*, five; *ampou*, ten. All these are Malay.

Ombay.—In Freycinet's *Voyage* the natives of Ombay are described as having olive-black complexions, flattened noses, thick lips, and long black hair. In Arago* we find a short vocabulary, of which a few words are Malay, whilst the rest are unlike anything either in the neighbouring language of Timor (at least as known by Raffles's specimens), or in any other language known to the author. Upon what grounds, unless it be their cannibalism, the Ombaians have been classed with the New Zealanders, is unknown. The evidence is certainly not taken from their language.

Between Timor and New Guinea we collect, either from positive statements or by inference, that, pure or mixed, there are Negritos

* Vide Note A.

in at least the following islands :—1, Wetta; 2, Kissa?; 3, Serwatty?; 4, Lette?; 5, Moa?; 6, Roma?; 7, Damma; 8, Lakor?; 9, Luan; 10, Sermatta; 11, Baba; 12, Daai; 13, Serua; 14, the Eastern Ar-roos; 15, Borassi. (Kollf's Voy.; Earl's Translation.)

The language of the important island of Timor-Laut is Malay. From a conversation with the sailor Forbes, who was on the island for sixteen years, the author learned that there are in Timor-Laut plenty of black slaves, but no black aborigines.

Celebes.—In the centre of Celebes and in the north there are Negritos: the inhabitants call them Turajas, and also Arafuras: they speak a simple dialect and pass for aborigines. (Raffles, History of Java.) Of this language we have no specimen. Gaimard's Menada is the Menadu of Sir Stamford Raffles, and Raffles's Menadu is Malay. (Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, ii. 191.) The remark made by the collector of this Menadu Vocabulary was, that those who spoke it were *whiter* than the true Bugis, and that they looked like South-Sea Islanders, a fact of value in a theory of the Dyacks, but of no value in the enumeration of the Negritos.

Bourou, Gammen, Salawatty, Battenta.—For each of these islands we have positive statements as to the existence of Negritos.

Gilolo.—In Lesson's Natural History the inhabitants of Gilolo are classed with those of Gammen, Battenta, &c., as Negritos. The same is the case in the Mithridates, where the inference is, that in all the Moluccas, with the exception of Amboyna and Ternati, Negritos are to be found in the interior. For Guebé see the sequel.

The Teetees.—The Teetee Islands of Meares, the Jauts or Aeaouw of the Mithridates, sixteen in number, are Negrito. (Meares, Voyage, Adelung.)

Oby.—According to Adelung this island is Negrito.

The object of what has gone before is less to state where Negritos are to be found than where they are to be looked for. Hence many of the above notices indicate the probable rather than the actual presence of them; and those statements concerning the Molucca localities that are taken from systematic books (and as such at second-hand) are all subject to one exception, viz. the fact that the tribes described as Arafura, although in current language Negrito, are not necessarily so. An instance of this has been seen in the so-called Arafura of Menadu. The same applies to the so-called Arafura of Ceram, (Handboek den Land-en-Volk-kunde van Nederlandsch Indie. P. P. Roorda van Eysinga. Amsterdam 1841; indicated by Mr. Garnett,) which is Malay. In the quarters about to be given in detail the evidence is less exceptionable.

New Guinea.—Here there is little except Negritos; and here we meet with the name *Papua*. What is said of the Papuas must be said with caution. Physical conformation being the evidence, there are in New Guinea two nations, if not more than two :—1. Those of the North, with curly hair, which are subdivided into the pure Papuas, and the Papuas that are looked upon as a cross with the Malay (Quoy, Gaimard and Lesson in the French Voyages). 2. Those of the South, with lank hair, called by the French naturalists Arafuras. The

author was unable to determine who were meant by the Alfakis of Quoy (Durville's Voyage, iv. 746). To the language of these Alfakis are possibly referable the ten words of Lesson. These are the numerals, and, as might be expected, Malay. For the South of New Guinea we have not so much as a single vocabulary or a single word.

Waigioo.—The Waigioo and New Guinea have been frequently confounded; we have therefore deferred speaking of the latter until we could also deal with the former. Without going into the conflicting evidence, we may state that there are two Vocabularies wherein arm is *kapiani*, and three wherein arm is *bramine*. Of the first division we have—1st, the Vocabularies of the Uranie and Physicienne Corvettes, under Freycinet, in 1817, 1818, 1819, as given in Arago's (the draughtsman's) Narrative, p. 275, English translation; and 2ndly, the Undetermined Vocabulary of Dentrecasteaux. Dentrecasteaux, whilst at Boni in Waigioo, saw some strangers who spoke a language very different from the inhabitants of that island; he considered that they came from New Guinea. Now this language is the Waigioo of Arago*; whilst the Waigioo of Dentrecasteaux is the Papua of Arago. Among the Vocabularies of the second class we have Gaimard's Rawak Vocabulary, stated especially (Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, vol. ii. p. 153.) to have been collected at Rawak in Waigioo in 1818: here, arm is *bramine*. Now a vocabulary (that will soon be mentioned) of the New Guinea Papuan of Port Dorey was collected during the expedition of the Astrolabe by the same naturalist, M. Gaimard. With this vocabulary Gaimard's Rawak coincides, rather than with Arago's Waigioo and Dentrecasteaux's Undetermined Vocabulary. This makes the third vocabulary for these islands. The fourth is Gaimard's Port Dorey Vocabulary (Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, ii. 146.). The fifth, Dentrecasteaux's (or La Billardiére) Waigioo Vocabulary. This represents the same language as those last-mentioned, inasmuch as in it arm is *bramine*, not *kapiani*. The sixth vocabulary is the Utanata, from Dutch authorities (vide Trans. Geogr. Soc.). The seventh is the Lobo Vocabulary.—Ibid. The eighth is Forest's Vocabulary. See Forest's Voyage to New Guinea. Such are the data for New Guinea and Waigioo. Dalrymple's Vocabulary will be noticed in the sequel.

Guebé.—The Guebé Vocabulary of the Astrolabe (Philologie, ii. 157) is the Guebé of Freycinet's Voyage in 1818, when it was collected by Gaimard. The Guebé of Arago (under Freycinet) also approaches the Guebé of Gaimard. According to D. Durville the Guebé is Papuan. The author however considered it Malay, though there was some resemblance to the Papuan, inasmuch as many Malay terms were common to both these dialects.

From New Guinea westward and southward the Negritos are no longer isolated. The following are Negrito Islands, or Negrito Archipelagos:—

1. New Britain; 2. New Hanover; 3. New Ireland; 4. Solo-

* See Note B.

mon's Islands; 5. Queen Charlotte's Archipelago; 6. Louisiade Archipelago; 7. Isles of Bougainville; 8. Bouka; 9. New Georgia; 10. Admiralty Isles,—York, Sandwich, Portland; 11. Santa Cruz Archipelago; 12. Arsacides; 13. Espiritu Santo, or New Hebrides,—Mallicollo, Erromango, Tanna, Erronan, Annatom; 14. New Caledonia; 15. Warouka, Bligh's and Banks's Island.—Astrolabe. The Ticopian is not Negrito but Polynesian.—Voyage de l'Astrolabe.

Fiji Islands.—In the Fiji Islands the physical character of the natives is half Negrito and half Polynesian. Here is the Negrito limit to the east; that is, of Negrito tribes as existing at the present moment.

The languages of the list just given are known to us through the following Vocabularies.

New Ireland.—Gaimard's Carteret Harbour Vocabulary.—Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, ii. 143.

Durville's Port Praslin Vocabulary, incorporated with Gaimard's Carteret Bay Vocabulary.—Ibid.

Dalrymple's so-called New Guinea Vocabulary. The word *so-called* was used because, unless there were natives of New Ireland on the coast of New Guinea, Dalrymple's Vocabulary is a representative of the Papuan. It coincides with those of Durville and Gaimard from New Ireland: it was collected by Schouten and Le Maire. It is also the New Guinea of De Brosses.

Vocabularies of four small islands are given by Dalrymple and De Brosses, viz. of Moses Island, Moa, Hoorn Island, and Cocos Island. These are the vocabularies of Reland (Diss. xi.), referred to by Adelung.

Manicolo.—In Queen Charlotte's Archipelago, or perhaps among the Solomon Islands, lies an island in name resembling one of the New Hebrides. Durville called it Vanikoro, but Captain Dillon assures me that the true name is Manicolo. Of the language spoken here we have a vocabulary collected by Gaimard in three dialects; the Vanikoro, the Tanema, and the Taneanou.—Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, ii. 164.

Mallicollo.—Cook's Island is Mallicollo. A glossary occurs in Cook's Voyages.

Tanna.—A single vocabulary in Cook's Voyages.

New Caledonia.—A short vocabulary in Cook. A longer one in Dentreasteaux and La Billardièrre.

Of the Fiji we have a few words by Cook, a long vocabulary by Gaimard (Astrol. Phil. ii. 136), Port regulations, and MS. Scripture translations, which afford us full and sufficient samples of the language. To deal with this as Negrito the Polynesian element must be eliminated.

In the way of Ethnography Madagascar is Asiatic; since its language, as has been known since the time of Reland, is Malay. For this island the evidence of physical character gives two or more races, but the evidence of language only one.

Australia.—In this island we have vocabularies for the following localities: (1.) Murray Island; (2.) Caledon Bay; (3. 4.) Endeavour

River; (5.) the Burrah Burrah tribe; (6.) Limestone Creek; (7.) Port Macquarie; (8.) Port Jackson; (9.) Menero Downs; (10.) Jervis Bay; (11.) Hunter's River, vide Threlkeld's Grammar; (12, 13, 14, 15.) Adelaide,—one of these being Teichelmann's and Schurmann's Grammar; (16.) Gulf St. Vincent; (17, 18, 19, 20.) King George's Sound; (22.) Grey's Vocabulary; and a few others.

Van Diemen's Land.—Here, as in Australia, everything is Negrito. In the way of Vocabularies, we have for the North,—(1.) Gaimard's Port Dalrymple Vocabulary, taken down from the mouth of a Van-Diemen's-Land woman at King George's Sound, with an Englishman as an interpreter.—Voy. Astr. Phil. ii. 9. In the South we have, (2.) Cook's Vocabulary, collected in Adventure Bay, S.E. of Van Diemen's Land,—nine words. (3.) Dentrecaesteaux's, or La Billardièrè's Vocabulary. (4.) Allan Cunningham's Vocabulary, collected in 1819 at Entrance Island. (5.) Dr. Lhotsky's Vocabulary, derived from Mr. M'Geary, and representing the language of Hobart's Town.—Journ. Geo. Soc. ix. Besides these, there is a Vocabulary procured by Mr. Robert Brown when in Australia. It nearly represents the same state of language as Dentrecaesteaux's Vocabulary.

Besides these remarks, another class of facts should be indicated. In the south of Japan, and in the Marianne Isles, there are statements that Blacks *have been*:—Père Cantovà (in Dupérrey and Freycinet), and Adelung (Mithr. i.). From Rienzi also we learn a statement of Lütke's, viz. that in Pounipet, one of the Carolines, there are abundance of Blacks at this moment; these *may* be indigenous. The hypothetical presence of Negritos may account also for certain peculiarities of the Polynesian of the Tonga Islands. There are traces of them in the Navigator's Archipelago. Crozet (see Pritchard's Phys. Hist.) mentions Negritos in New Zealand, and Cook speaks to a tradition of aboriginal Negritos in Tahiti.

Such are the notices of the Oceanic Negritos in respect to their distribution and the amount of evidence afforded by the specimens of their language. The current opinion is, that over a certain area Blacks of a certain race or races were aborigines. This opinion there is no reason to disturb or to refine upon; the general question is as to the unity or the multiplicity of these races; but the more specific object of the present paper is to ascertain how far that question is decided by the comparison of their languages. The safe way is to *ascend* in the classification, and to begin with determining the uniformity of speech over limited areas, and within natural boundaries. The most convenient locality to begin with is—

New Guinea.—That four out of the seven New Guinea Vocabularies (supposing them to have been collected independently of each other) represent either dialects of one language, or else languages closely allied, appears on the first comparison. These Vocabularies are,—(a) Gaimard's Rawak; (b) Gaimard's Port Dorey; (c) Arago's Papua; and (d) Dentrecaesteaux's Waigioo. To these Forest's Vocabulary (supposing always that his words have not been incorporated in the

vocabularies that came after him) approaches more closely than to the other two.

ENGLISH.	FOREST.	DENTRECASTRAUX, &c.
<i>fish</i>	een	iené, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>bird</i>	moorsankeen .	mazaukéhéné.
<i>man</i>	sononman ...	snoné, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>woman</i>	binn	biéné, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>fire</i>	for	afor.
<i>water</i>	war	ouar, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>sand</i>	yeau	iené.
<i>house</i>	rome	rouma, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>hook</i>	sofydine	sarfedinne.
<i>sun</i>	rass	riass.

Of the two remaining vocabularies the Lobo comes nearer to Forest than the Utanata does. Neither, however, coincide with Forest, as Forest coincides with the first four: nor yet do they coincide so closely with each other.

ENGLISH.	FOREST.	LOBO.
<i>arrow</i>	ekay	larakai.
<i>bird</i>	moorsankeen .	manoc.
<i>hog</i>	ben	booi, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>island</i>	meossy	nusu.
<i>sun</i>	rass	orak.
<i>tree</i>	kaibus	akajuakar.
<i>woman</i>	binn	mawinna, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>water</i>	war	malar.
<i>yes</i>	io	oro.

ENGLISH.	FOREST.	UTANATA.
<i>bow</i>	myay	amuré.
<i>I</i>	iya	area.
<i>slave</i>	omini	manoki.
<i>tree</i>	kaibus	kai, <i>wood</i> .
<i>water</i>	war	warani, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>yes</i>	io	aroa.

Again :

ENGLISH.	UTANATA.	LOBO.
<i>basin</i>	pigani	bingau.
<i>cheeks</i>	awamu	wafiwiriongo.
<i>death</i>	namata	namata, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>drink (to)</i>	nemuka	makinu, and also eat.
<i>evening</i>	jauw aroă ...	urwawa.
<i>eyes</i>	mamé	matatongo, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>feathers</i>	wiegu	wo eru, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>great</i>	napitteki	nabitteki.
<i>hands</i>	toe mare	nimango uta, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>hog</i>	oe	booi, <i>Malay</i> ?
<i>handsome</i>	nata	nangewie.
<i>here</i>	aré	inairi.
<i>head</i>	oepauw	umun.
<i>iron</i>	puruti	wurusesi.
<i>knife</i>	tai	toeri, for chopping.
<i>lemons</i>	munda	munda.
<i>little</i>	mimiti	netie.
<i>long</i>	marawas	marawas.
<i>lay (to)</i>	aïkai	koekeimanse.

ENGLISH.	UTANATA.	LOBO.
<i>man</i>	marowane	marowane.
<i>mouth</i>	irie	oriengo.
<i>noon</i>	kameti aroa.....	oertoto, <i>evening</i> .
<i>plate</i>	pigani	piring.
<i>rain</i>	komak	komak.
<i>river</i>	warari napeteki .	walar nabetik, <i>water great</i> .
<i>rope</i>	warauw	waras.
<i>sago</i>	kinani	kakana.
<i>slave</i>	manoki.....	mooi.
<i>seek</i>	matigati	nawitik.
<i>speak (to)</i>	iwari.....	iwari.
<i>take away (to)</i>	namatorani	motara.

New Ireland.—As far as we have vocabularies for evidence, the language of New Ireland is one.

ENGLISH.	PORT PRASLIN.	CARTERET BAY.	DALRYMPLE.
<i>beard</i>	katissendi	kambissek	incambesser, <i>M</i> .
<i>arms</i>	limak	pongliman, <i>M</i> .
<i>bananas</i>	ounn	tachouner, <i>M</i> .
<i>belly</i>	balang	bala.
<i>fish</i>	siss	hissou.
<i>fire</i>	bia	eef.
<i>forehead</i>	poussou nourou	posson arong.
<i>buttocks</i>	kambali	kabalik.....
<i>back</i>	ptarou	tarouk
<i>eye</i>	matal	matak <i>M</i> .
<i>ear</i>	pala tignai	pralenhék.....
<i>foot</i>	pekendi	balankeki	kekeign.
<i>finger</i>	lima	oulimak	cateling liman.
<i>hair</i>	epiou	iouk <i>M</i> .
<i>iron</i>	siner.....	siner.....
<i>neck</i>	kindourous	kondarouak
<i>nose</i>	mboussou.....	kamboussouk ...	nisson.
<i>shoulder</i>	kamliman	kamlima
<i>tooth</i>	ninissai	inaik.....	ysangh, <i>M</i> .
<i>water</i>	moloum	maloum <i>M</i> .
<i>moon</i>	calang	kalan.

For the affinities of the dialects of Moa, Moses Island, Cocos Island, Hoorn Island, to those of New Ireland, see Dalrymple's *Island Voyages*, *ad fin*. That the differences in Manicolo are those of dialect, may be seen from Gaimard's Vocabulary.

Australia.—That the Australian languages are one, at least in the way that the Indo-European languages are one, is likely from henceforward to be admitted. Captain Grey's statement upon the subject is to be found in his work upon Australia. His special proof of the unity of the Australian language is amongst the unprinted papers of the Geographical Society. The opinions of Threlkeld and Teichelmanngo the same way. The author's own statements are as follows:—

(1.) For the whole round of the coast there is, generally speaking, no vocabulary of sufficient length that, in some word or other, does not coincide with the vocabulary of the nearest point, the language of which is known to us. If it does not do this it agrees with some of the remoter dialects. Flinder's Carpentarian, compared with the two vocabularies of the Endeavour River, has seventeen

words in common*. Of these, three, perhaps four, coincide. Eye, *meal*, C.; *meul*, E. R.; hair, *marra*, C.; *morye*, E. R.; fingers, *mingel*, C.; *mungal bah*, E. R.; breast, *gummur*, C.; *coyor*, E. R.

Endeavour River.—Two vocabularies.—Compared with the vocabularies generally of Port Jackson, and parts south and east of Port Jackson:—Eye, *meul*, E. R.; *milla*, L. C.; nose, *emurda*, E. R.; *morro*, L. C.; ears, *mulkah*, E. R.; *moko*, P. Macquarie: hair, *morye*, E. R.; *mundah*, B. B.; breast, *coyor*, E. R.; *kowul*, P. J.; fingers, *mungal bah*, E. R.; *maranga*, B. B.; elbow, *yeerwe*, E. R.; *yongra*, Menero Downs: nails, *kolke*, E. R.; *karungun*? P. J.; beard, *wollar*, E. R.; *walo*, Jervis's Bay; *wollak*, Port Macquarie. The number of words submitted to comparison was twenty-two.

Menero Downs (Lhotsky), and Adelaide (G. W. Earl).—Thirteen words in common, whereof two coincide.

hand..... morangan, M.D. ...*murra, Adel.
tongue talang taling.

Adelaide (G. W. Earl) and Gulf St. Vincent (Astrolabe).

beard mutta, A molda, G. S. V.
ear iri ioure,
foot tinna, tenna,
hair yuka, iouka,
hand..... murrah, malla,
leg irako, ierko,
nose mula, mudla,
teeth..... tial, ta.

Gulf St. Vincent (Astrolabe) and King George's Sound (Nind and Astrolabe); fifty words in common.

wood kalla, G. S. V. kokol, K. G. S.
mouth ta, taa,
hair iouka, tchao,
neck mannoult, wolt,
finger malla, mal,
water kawé, kepe,
tongue talein, talen,
foot tenna, tchen,
stone..... poure, pore,
laugh kanghin, kaoner.

(2.) The vocabularies of distant points coincide; out of sixty words in common we have eight coincident.

ENGLISH.	JERVIS'S BAY.	GULF ST. VINCENT.
<i>forehead</i>	holo	iouillo.
<i>man</i>	mika	meio.
<i>milk</i>	awanham	ammenhalo.
<i>tongue</i>	talen	talein.
<i>hand</i>	maramale	malla.
<i>nipple</i>	amgnann	amma.
<i>black</i>	mourak	pouilloul.
<i>nails</i>	berenou	pere.

(3.) The most isolated of the vocabularies, e. g. the Carpentarian,

* The author explained, that he used the term "in common" as opposed to "coincident;" and by the phrase "so many words in common," meant so many words occurring in any two vocabularies, and expressing the same idea.

if compared with the remaining vocabularies, taken as a whole, has certain words to be found in different and distant parts of the island.

ENGLISH.	CARPENTARIAN.
<i>eye</i>	mail..... milla, L. C.
<i>nose</i>	hurroo..... morro, L. C.

The following is a notice of certain words coinciding, though taken from dialects far separated :—

<i>lips</i>	tambamba, Men. D.....	tamande, G. S. V.
<i>star</i>	jingi, ditto	tchindai, K. G. S.
<i>forehead</i>	ullo, ditto.....	ioulo, G. S. V.
<i>beard</i>	yernka, Adel.	{ arnga, } K. G. S.
		{ nanga, }
<i>bite</i>	paiandi, ditto	badjeen, ditto.
<i>fire</i>	gaadla, ditto	kaal, ditto.
<i>heart</i>	karlto, ditto	koort, ditto.
<i>sun</i>	tindo, ditto	djaat, ditto.
<i>tooth</i> }	tia, ditto	dowal, ditto.
<i>edge</i> ... }		
<i>water</i>	kauwe, ditto	kowwin, ditto.
<i>stone</i>	pure, ditto	boye, ditto.

In the way of grammatical inflection we find indications of the same unity. We find also differences upon which we should be careful against laying too much stress. The inflection of the number is an instance of the difference. In South Australian—*tinyara*, a boy; *tinyarurla*, two boys; *tinyar-anna*, boys. In Western Australia—*yago*, a woman; *yago-mun*, women; *goolang*, a child; *goolang-gurrah*, children (*gurra*, many); *doorda*, a dog; *doorda-goodjal*, two dogs; *doorda boula*, many dogs (*boula*, many). Here there is a difference where we generally find agreement, viz. in the inflectional (or quasi-inflectional) expression of the numbers. The difference, however, is less real than apparent. The Australian is one of those languages (so valuable in general philology) where we find inflections in the act of forming, and that from the agglutination, not of affixes, suffixes, and prefixes, but of words. In other terms, inflection is evolving itself out of composition. The true view then, of different forms for the same idea, is not that the inflections are unlike, but that the quasi-inflectional circumlocutions differ from each other in different dialects. There is no inflectional parallel between *two men* in English and *ἀνθρώπων* in Greek.

Van Diemen's Land, South.—For the South of Van Diemen's Land the language seems radically one. The following is what Cook has in common with Dentrecasteaux (or La Billardière) and Allan Cunningham.

ENGLISH.	COOK.	1803.	D. C.	A. C.
<i>woman</i>	quadne.....	cuani	quani	
<i>eye</i>	evera	nubere	nubere	nammurruck.
<i>nose</i>	muidje	mugid	muigui.....	meoun.
<i>ear</i>	koidgi	cuengi-lia	{ cuegnilia }	gounreek.
			{ vaigui ... }	
			{ ouagui ... }	

Lhotsky's Vocabulary stands more alone; with the Vocabulary of

1803 and Dentrecaesteaux's Vocabulary, it has but three (or two) coincident:—tongue, *mina*, Lh.; *mene*, Voc. of 1803: water, *lugana*, Lh.; *lia*, Voc. 1803; drink, *lugana*, Lh.; *laina*, Voc. 1803. With Allan Cunningham's Vocabulary it has fourteen words in common, and three coincident:—nose, *minerana*, Lh.; *meoun*, A. C.: tongue, *mina*, Lh.; *mim*, A. C.: fire, *lope*, Lh.; *lope*, A. C. Brown and Cunningham coincide a little more than Cunningham and Lhotsky. It is perhaps safe to say, that for the South of Van Diemen's Land the language, as represented by its vocabularies, is radically one.

Van Diemen's Land, North.—In Lhotsky's Vocabulary seven words are marked W, four E, and one S, as being peculiar to the western, eastern and southern parts of the island. One of the four words marked E is found in the Port Dalrymple Vocabulary, being the only word common to the two, *e. g.* wood, *mumanara*, E.; *moumra*, Port Dalrymple. The coincidence of the North and South is as follows:—

ENGLISH.	PORT DALRYMPLE.	LHOTSKY.
<i>ear</i>	tiberatie	pitserata.
<i>eye</i>	elpina	lepina.
<i>leg</i>	langna	langana, <i>foot</i> .
<i>hawk</i>	gan henen henen.....	ingenana.
<i>posteriors</i>	wabrede	wabrede.
<i>man</i>	lusuina.....	looudouenne.
<i>night</i>	livore	levira.
<i>sea</i>	legana	lugana, <i>fresh water</i> .
<i>tooth</i>	iane	yana.

ENGLISH.	PORT DALRYMPLE.	BROWN & D. C.
<i>belly</i>	magueleni	lomongui.
<i>bird</i>	iola	oille.
<i>kangaroo</i>	taramai	tara.
<i>lips</i>	mona	mogudilia.
<i>nose</i>	medouer	mugid.
<i>stone</i>	lenn parene	loine.
<i>tooth</i>	iane	canan.
<i>arms</i>	regoula.....	rilia.

About thirty-five words are common to Lhotsky and the Vocabularies of Brown and Dentrecaesteaux. From the foregoing observations we may conclude that for the whole of Van Diemen's Land (as far as represented by the Vocabularies) the language is radically one.

Such are the groups as spread over limited areas and confined within natural boundaries. The affinity of speech between different islands is another question.

Preliminary to this we must eliminate the Malay from the Negrito. The full knowledge that this has been done imperfectly, invalidates all that we have arrived at; so that, once for all, it may be stated, that what is asserted respecting the amount of words common to two localities, is asserted subject to the condition of their being true Negrito and not Malay.

Andaman and Samang.—Few words in common; one coincident, and that borrowed in all probability from a third language.

New Guinea and Waigioo.—By Waigioo is meant the Waigioo of Arago, and the Undetermined Vocabulary of Dentrecaesteaux. They have about forty words in common, and the following are coincident:—

ENGLISH.	WAIGIOO?	NEW GUINEA?
<i>hand</i>	cocani, D.	konef.
<i>belly</i>	sgnani, A.	sneouar.
<i>cheek</i>	ganga foni, A.....	gaiafœ.
<i>breast</i>	mansou, A.	soussou.
<i>eyes</i>	tagueni, D.	tadeni.
<i>eyelids</i>	inekarnei, A.	karneou.
<i>foot</i>	courgnaï, A.....	œkourae, <i>heel</i> .
<i>fire</i>	clap, A.	ap, afor.
<i>hair</i>	senoumebouran, A....	sonebrahene.
<i>knee</i>	capougi, A.	one-pouer.
<i>rain</i>	mei, D.	meker.
<i>sand</i>	saine, D.	iene, <i>Malay</i> .
<i>nose</i>	{ sauny, D. }	soidon, <i>mouth</i> .
<i>stuff</i> (made of bark of tree) }	{ soun, A. ... }	
	male, D.	maran, <i>Malay</i> .

New Guinea and New Ireland.—Forest and Dalrymple :—fish, *een*, F.; *hissou*, D. Mal.; fire, *for*, F.; *eeff*, D. Mal.; sand, *yeau*, F.; *coon*, D.; sun, *ras*, F.; *nass*, D.; star, *mak*, F.; *maemetia*, D. Dalrymple and Utanata.—Upwards of twenty-five words in common :—Earth, *taar*, D.; *tiri*, Mal., Ut. : eat, *nam nam*, D.; *nemuka*, Ut. : tongue, *hermangh*, D.; *mare*, Ut. *Dalrymple and Lobo*.—About thirty words in common :—arms, *pongliman*, D.; *nimango*, Ut.; Mal. : belly, *balang*, D.; *kanborongo*, Ut. : tongue, *hermangh*, D.; *karioŋgo*, Ut.

Port Praslin and Carteret Bay (taken together), and *Utanata and Lobo* (taken together).—For the sake of comparison, the whole of the words that the two (or four) Vocabularies have in common are exhibited, and by their side the equivalents in Latin and in Greek.

ENGLISH.	UTAN. LOB.	P. P. AND C. B.	LATIN.	GREEK.
<i>arm</i>	nimango	limak	brachium...	ὠλένη.
<i>back</i>	tergum.....	νῶτον.
<i>belly</i>	kan-borongo ...	bala	venter	γαστήρ.
<i>beard</i>	barba	πώγων.
<i>bud</i>	manok	mani	avis	ὄρνις.
<i>breast</i>	pectus	στῆθος.
<i>black</i>	ikoko	guiam	niger	μέλας.
<i>cough</i>	wouru	lou-koro	tussis	βήξ.
<i>dog</i>	wure.....	poul	canis.....	κύων.
<i>dance</i>	salio	χορεύομαι.
<i>eyes</i>	matatongo	mata.....	oculus	ὄφθαλμος.
— <i>brows</i>	wura.....	pouli matandi	supercilium.	ὀφρύς.
<i>ear</i>	auris.....	οὖς.
<i>eat</i>	edo	ἐσθίω.
<i>fish</i>	piscis	ἰχθύς.
<i>foot</i>	kaingo	balan keke	pes	ποῦς.
<i>finger</i>	nimango sori ...	lima	digitus	δάκτυλος.
<i>fire</i>	ignis.....	πῦρ.
<i>great</i>	magnus ...	μέγας.
<i>hair</i>	crinitus ...	θρίξ.
<i>hand</i>	manus	χεῖρ.
<i>hog</i>	booi	bouri	porcus	χοῖρος.
<i>head</i>	œpauw	ponklouk	caput	κεφάλη.
<i>knee</i>	kairigo-woko ...	{ tangoulou kekendi } { pougaigi	genu	γόνυ.
<i>mouth</i>	os	στόμα.
<i>moon</i>	luna	σελήνη.

ENGLISH.	UTAN. LOB.	P. P. AND C. B.	LATIN.	GREEK.
<i>neck</i>	<i>collum</i>	<i>τράχηλος.</i>
<i>nose</i>	<i>nasus</i>	<i>ρίς.</i>
<i>no</i>	<i>non</i>	<i>οὐ.</i>
<i>red</i>	<i>napetiaro</i>	<i>tara</i>	<i>ruber</i>	<i>έρυθρός.</i>
<i>run</i>	<i>curro</i>	<i>τρέχω.</i>
<i>sugar-cane</i>
<i>tongue</i>	<i>kariongo</i>	<i>kermea</i>	<i>lingua</i>	<i>γλῶσσα.</i>
<i>thigh</i>	<i>femur</i>	<i>μηρός.</i>
<i>teeth</i>	<i>dens</i>	<i>ὀδοὺς.</i>
<i>water</i>	{ <i>malar</i> <i>waran</i> }	<i>moloum</i>	<i>aqua</i>	<i>ὕδωρ.</i>
<i>yes</i>	<i>oro</i>	<i>io</i>	<i>imo</i>	<i>ναιχι.</i>

With thirty-seven words in common, the two Negrito languages have seventeen coincident; with thirty-seven words in common, the two classical languages have nine coincident. The evidence, therefore, of the affinity of the Papua and New Ireland is stronger than of the Latin and Greek, as determined from identical *data*.

New Ireland and Manicolo.—The Port-Praslin and Carteret Bay Vocabularies being dealt with as one for New Ireland, and the three dialects being treated as one for Manicolo, we have, out of twenty-eight words in common, the following coinciding:—yes, *io*, P. P.; *io*, C. B.; *io*, Manic.: eye, *mata*, P. P.; *matak*, C. B.; *mala*, *maleo*, *mataeo*, Man., *Mal.*: banana, *ounn*, C. B.; *pounha*, *ounra*, *ounro*, Man., *Mal.*: canoe, *kouan*, C. B.; *naoure*, *goia*, *koure*, Manic., *Mal.*: tooth, *ninissai*, P. P.; *insik*, C. B.; *indje*, Tanean: testes, *puen*, P. P.; *boua*, *bouinini*, *boua ini*, Man.: beard, *kam-bissek*, C. B. (*incam besser*, Dalr.); *oungoumie*, *vingoumie*, Man., *Mal.*: breast, *boroick*, C. B.; *berenhennam*, Man.; ear, *palalignai*, P. P.; *pralen*, C. B.; *manbalenhi*, Manic.; hair, *nihouge*, D.; *anaoko*, Man.

Manicolo and Mallicollo.—Eighteen words in common, the following coincident:—Bread-fruit, *baloe*, Man.; *barabe*, Mall.: cocoa-nut, *venoure*, Man.; *naroo*, Mall.: eye, *mataeo*, Man.; *maitang*, Mall., *Mal.*: ear, *tagnaini*, Man.; *talingan*, Mall., *Mal.*: bird, *menouka*, Man.; *moero*, Mall., *Mal.*: head, *batcha*, Man.; *basaine*, Mall.: hog, *boi boi*, Man.; *brrooas*, Mall., *Mal.*: no, *tae*, Man.; *taep*, Mall.: water, *ouine*, Man.; *ergour*, Mall.: drink, *kanou*, *nanou*, Man.; *nooae*, Mall.

Mallicollo and Tanna.—Sixteen words in common:—cocoa-nuts, *naroo*, Mall.; *nabooy*, Tann.: drink, *noaee*, Mall.; *nooee*, Tann., *Mal.*: eye, *maitang*, Mall.; *manee maiuk*, Tann., *Mal.*: ears, *talingan*, Mall.; *feeneenguk*, Tann., *Mal.*: bird, *mderoo*, Mall.; *manoo*, Tann., *Mal.*: hog, *brrooas*, *Mal.*; *boogas*, Tann., *Mal.*: navel, *nemprtong*, Mall.; *napeerainguk*, Tann.: teeth, *reebohn*, *warrewuk*, Mall.; *raibuk*, Tann.: water, *ergour*, Mall.; *namawarain*, Tann.: woman, *rabin*, Mall.; *naibraan*, Tann., *Mal.*

Tanna and Mallicollo (taken together) *and New Caledonia.*—Neither with Mallicollo or Tanna alone, nor with Mallicollo and Tanna taken together, as compared with New Caledonia, do we find more words coincident than the following:—Cocoa-nut, *naroo*, M.; *nabooy*, T.; *neeo*, N. Cal., *Mal.*: drink, *noaee*, M.; *nooee*, T.; *oondoo*, N. Cal.: head, *noogwanaium*, T.; *garmoin* (Cook), *vangué*,

(L. B.), N. Cal.; yams, *oofe*, Tann.; *oobe*, N. Cal., Mal.: yes, *eeo*, Tann.; *elo*, N. Cal.: no, *taep*, Mall.; *nda*, N. Cal.

Next in order comes the comparison between the Vocabularies of Van Diemen's Land and South Australia.

Port Dalrymple and King George's Sound (Nind and Astrol.):—Wound, *barana*, P. D.; *bareuk*, N.: wood, *moumbra*, P. D.; *pourn*, N.: hair, *kide*, P. D.; *kaat*, N.: thigh, *degagla*, P. D.; *tawal*, N.: kangaroo, *taramai*, P. D.; *taamour*, N.: lips, *mona*, P. D.; *mele*, K. G. S.: no, *poutie*, P. D.; *poualt*, *poort*, K. G. S.: egg, *komeka*, P. D.; *kierkee*, K. G. S.: bone, *pnale*, P. D.; *nouil*, K. G. S. (bone of bird used to suck up water) N.: skin, *kidna*, P. D.; *kiao*? K. G. S.: two, *kateboueve*, P. D.; *kadjen*, K. G. S. (N.). Fifty-six words in common.

Port Dalrymple and Gulf St. Vincent.—Mouth, *mona*, P. D.; *ta-monde*, G. S. V. (a compound word, since *taa* is mouth, in K. G. S.): drink, *kible*, P. D.; *kaue*, G. S. V.: arm, *anme*, P. D.; *aondo* (also shoulder), G. S. V.: hawk, *gan henen henen*, P. D.; *nanno*, G. S. V.: hunger, *tigate*, P. D.; *takiou*, G. S. V.: head, *eloura*, P. D.; *iouullo*, G. S. V.: nose, *medouer**, P. D.; *modla*, G. S. V.: bird, *iola*, *pallo*, G. S. V.: stone, *lenn parenne*, P. D.; *poure*? G. S. V.: foot, *dogna*, P. D.; *tenna*, G. S. V.: sun, *tegoura*†, P. D.; *tendo*, G. S. V. Seventy words in common.

Port Dalrymple and Jervis's Bay.—Wound, *barana*, P. D.; *kararra*, J. B.: tooth, *iane*, P. D.; *ira*, J. B.: skin, *kidna*, P. D.; *bagagno*, J. B.: foot, *dogna*, P. D.; *tona*‡, J. B.: head, *eloura*, P. D.; *hollo*, J. B. Fifty-four words in common. What follows is a notice of some miscellaneous coincidences between the Van Diemen's Land and the Australian.

ENGLISH VAN DIEMEN'S LAND. AUSTRALIA.

<i>ears</i>	cuengilia, 1803	gundugeli. Men. D.
<i>thigh</i>	tula, Lh	dara, Men. D.
<i>stone</i>	{ pure, Adel } { voye, K. G. S. .. }lenn parenne, P. D.
<i>breast</i>	pinenana, Lh	voyene, Men. D.
<i>skin</i>	kidna, P. D.....	makundo, Teichelman.
<i>day</i>	megra, Lh	mangeri, Men. D.
<i>run</i>	mella, Lh.....	monri, Men. D.
<i>feet</i>	perre, D. C.....	birre §.
<i>little</i>	bodenevoued, P. D...	baddoeen, Grey.
<i>lip</i>	mona, P. D.....	tameno (<i>upper lip</i>), ditto.
<i>egg</i>	komeka, P. D.....	muka. <i>egg, anything round</i> , Teichel.
<i>tree</i>	moumra, P. D.....	worra (<i>forest</i>), Teichel.
<i>mouth</i>	{ kamy, Cook. } { kane, P. D. }kame .. { <i>speak.</i> <i>mouth.</i> <i>cry.</i> } J. B.
<i>tongue</i> ...		
<i>tooth</i>		
<i>speak</i>		
<i>leg</i>	darra, P. J.	lerai.
<i>knee</i>	gorook, ditto	ronga, D. C.
<i>moon</i>	tegoura, P. D.....	kakirra, Teichelman.
<i>nose</i>	medouer, P. D. ...	{ mudla, ditto. moolya, Grey.
<i>hawk</i>	gan henen henen, P. D.	gargyne, ditto.
<i>hunger</i>	tegate, P. D.	taityo, Teichelman.

* Mula. † Also Moon. ‡ tjenne, tidna, jeena. § Generally toe-nail.

ENGLISH.	VAN DIEMEN'S LAND.	AUSTRALIA.
<i>laugh</i>pigne, P. D.....	mengk, Grey.
<i>moon</i>vena, 1835	yennadah, P. J.
<i>day</i>megra, 1835.....	karmaroo, ditto.
<i>fire</i>une, 1803	yong, ditto.
<i>dew</i>manghelena, rain	menniemoolong.
<i>water</i>boue lakade.....	{ neylucka, Murray, P. D. bado, ditto. lucka, Carpenterian.

Such is the similarity amongst the Negrito languages, as taken in their geographical sequence, and as divided into three groups. Between the Andaman and Samang there is no visible similarity or coincidence. From New Guinea to New Caledonia there is a series of coincidences; and there is also similarity between the Australian and Van Diemen's Land. But it is far from following that, because languages will form groups when taken in geographical succession, they will also form groups when the sequence or succession shall be interrupted. Tested by another method there is an affinity as follows :

ENGLISH.	MANICOLO.	NEW GUINEA.
<i>arms</i>me, menini, maini	nimango, L., <i>Mal.</i>
<i>belly</i>tchàn-hane, tchaene ...	{ kanborongo, L. sgnani, W.
<i>bow</i>ore	amure, Ut.
<i>drink</i>canou	{ makinu, L. } <i>Mal.</i> quienne, A.
<i>eye</i>mala, mateo.....	mame, U.; matatongo, U., <i>Mal.</i>
<i>sun</i>ouioia	jauw, U.
<i>tongue</i>mia, mimeao	mare, Ut.
<i>woman</i>venime, vignivi	{ mawina, L. } <i>Mal.</i> viene, A.
<i>yes</i>io	aroa, U., oro, L.
<i>ear</i>tagnaini, ragnengo	{ kanik, kananie, A. } <i>Mal.</i> tantougni, W.
<i>fish</i>ane, gniene	iene, A., <i>Mal.</i>
<i>nose</i>n-hele	nony, A.
<i>water</i>ouire	{ ouara, A., <i>Mal.</i> war, F.
<i>teeth</i>ongne	oualini, analini, W.
<i>shoulders</i>outalen-buien-hane.....	poupouni, <i>Waig.</i>

ENGLISH.	NEW CALEDONIA.	NEW IRELAND.
<i>ant</i>kinki	akan, P. P.
<i>tooth</i>inouan	insik, C. B., <i>Mal.</i>
<i>bird</i>manou	mane, C. B., <i>Mal.</i>
<i>cheeks</i>poangue	paring, D.
<i>eyebrows</i>poutchie-banghie	pouli-matandi, P. P.
<i>fire</i>afi, hiepp	bia.
<i>foot</i>bakatiengue.....	{ kekeign, D. balankeke, C. P.
<i>knees</i>bangueligha.....	pougaigi, P. P.
<i>tongue</i>coubmeigha, coumean ...	kermea.
<i>moon</i>ndan.....	kalan, P. P.
<i>walk</i>ouanem	inan.
<i>rain</i>oda	ous, D., <i>Mal.</i>
<i>nose</i>mandec	mboussou, P. P.
<i>sleep</i>kingo	heim, D.
<i>black</i>ganne	guiam.
<i>sun</i>niangat	naas, D.
<i>navel</i>padan-bourigne, pamboran	ponta, P. P., <i>Mal.</i>

ENGLISH.	NEW CALEDONIA.	NEW IRELAND.
see	dene.....	dan (<i>water</i>), D., <i>Mal.</i>
weep	ngot.....	igneek, C. B.

ENGLISH.	NEW CALEDONIA.	MANICOLOR.
back	donuha	dienhane diene.
ear	guening	ragnengo.
good	kapareick.....	kapai.
head	bangue.....	batcha.
moon	manoc	mele.

<i>fingers</i>	beguia	badouheigha.
<i>nose</i>	mongui	mandec, vanding.
<i>sleep</i>	makunya	kingo.
ENGLISH. ANDAMAN.		MISCELLANEOUS.
<i>ear</i>	quaka	{ cuengi, V. D. L. gueening, N. C.
<i>hand</i>	gonie	gong, Austr., or V. D. L.
<i>mouth</i>	morna	mona, V. D. L.
<i>nose</i>	mellee	{ mudla medouer } V. D. L.
<i>sun</i>	ahay	jauw, Utan.
<i>thighs</i>	poye	pengue paan, N. C.
<i>wood</i>	kianté	tanghee, N. C.

The author concludes his paper with the following observations :—

1. For all that is known to the contrary, the Negrito tongues of Sumatra, Borneo, Timor, the Moluccas, Formosa, and several smaller islands of whose languages we have no specimens, may be in any relation whatever to any other language, and to each other.

2. The Andamanee and Samang may be in any relation to any other Negrito tongue, or to each other, beyond that of mere dialect.

3. The languages hitherto known of New Guinea, New Ireland, the Solomon's Isles, New Caledonia, Tanna, and Mallicollo, are related to each other, *at least* as the most different languages of the Indo-European tribe are related.

4. The known languages of Australian are related to each other, *at least* in the same degree.

5. The Van Diemen's Land and Australian are similarly related.

6. Classified in divisions equally general with the Indo-European, the Negrito dialects (as far as they are known by their vocabularies) cannot fall into more than four, and may possibly be reducible to one; the data being up to a certain point sufficient to determine radical affinities, but nowhere sufficient to determine radical differences.

7. The ethnographical divisions, according to physical conformation, coincides with the ethnographical divisions according to language, only so far as the former avoid the details of classification. With the minute subdivision of the French naturalists the latter coincide least.

8. The distinction between the Negritos and the Malays seems less broad when determined by the test of language, than it does when measured by physical conformation.

9. The notion of the hybridism of the Papuas, arising from the view of their physical conformation, is in a degree confirmed by the nature of their language; although even the physical evidence is not absolute, *i. e.* on a par with that respecting the hybridism of the Griquas and Confusos.

10. With two * (if not more) Negrito tribes, whereof the evidence of language is wholly wanting, physiological differences indicate a probability of difference of language, equal to the difference between any two Negrito languages of which we have specimens.

11. Even in the physiological classifications we are far from being sure that the whole number of Negrito tribes has been described.

* The Blacks of the Philippines and the Blacks of the South of New Guinea.

.

NOTE B.

<i>arm</i>	kapiani, A. ; capiani, D.
<i>buttock</i>	seni and senidokaouri, A. ; tiangapoui, D.
<i>belly</i>	sgnani, A. ; iani, D.
<i>back</i>	kouaneteni, A. ; cateni, D.
<i>chin</i>	gambapi, A. ; capapi, D.
<i>dugs</i>	mansou, A. ; sou (<i>bosom</i>), D.
<i>eyes</i>	jadjiemouri, A. ; taguini, D.
<i>fingers</i>	cantoulili, D.
— <i>fore</i>	konkant-ili, A.
— <i>middle</i>	kouanti-poulo, A.
— <i>ring</i>	kouanti-ripali, A.
— <i>little</i>	kouanti-lminki, A.
<i>foot</i>	kourgnaï, A. ; caloani, D.
<i>hair</i>	sénoumébouran, A. ; pia, D.
<i>hand</i>	konk-afaleni, A. ; cocani, D.
<i>heel</i>	konk-abiouli, A.
<i>knee</i>	konk-apoki, A. ; capougui, D.
<i>leg</i>	konkanfai, A. ; anga fuini, D.
<i>nose</i>	soun, A. ; sauny, D.
<i>nails</i>	cambrene, A. ; cabrene, D.
<i>teeth</i>	oualini, A. ; analini, D.
<i>toe, great</i>	kouanti-hel, A.
—, <i>second and fourth</i> ...	kouanti-bipali, A.
—, <i>third</i>	kouanti-poulo, A.
—, <i>little</i>	kouanti-lminki, A.
<i>thigh</i>	affoloni, A. ; enfoloni, or anfoloni, D.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

FEBRUARY 24, 1843.

No. 5.

Professor MALDEN in the Chair.

Professors F. Bopp and J. Grimm were proposed to the Society for election as Honorary Members.

The Chairman stated, that reports had been laid before the Council on the claims of these two scholars to be elected Honorary Members, and the Council after deliberation had permitted the reports to be read to the Meeting.

The reports were then read (in the absence of Professor Wilson and Mr. Kemble) by the Secretary.

The following candidates were balloted for, and duly elected Members of the Society :—

Lord Lyttelton.

Edward T. B. Twistleton, Esq., Poor Law Commissioner, and late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.

Rev. James Scholefield, Regius Professor of Greek, Cambridge.

Joseph Payne, Esq., Denmark Hill, Camberwell.

The following communications were then read :

“ On the Origin of the phrase ‘ Wager of Law.’ ” By Professor Carey.

In certain actions the defendant was formerly allowed, in answer to the plaintiff's case, to swear he did not owe the sum demanded, whereupon he was adjudged *to wage the plaintiff his law*. The defendant then found pledges for the performance of what the court had awarded, and was required to appear in court on a certain day. If he appeared, and a certain number of compurgators swore they believed his oath, he was by this simple process enabled to defeat the plaintiff's claim. In performing that which he had waged, he was said *to perfect his law* (*legem facere vel perficere*). The author proposed to trace the history of these singular phrases.

The Norman Customary, c. 67, treats “ *des querelles et des loix parquoy les querelles doibvent estre finees,*” and ch. 121, 122, 124, treat respectively,

De *loy* qui est faicte par record,

De *loy* prouable,

De *loy* apparissant.

The *law* which is made by record is in principle the same as our Trial by Record. If one party assert the existence of a record, and

another deny it, the issue is not tried by a jury, but by the production or non-production of the record, whose existence is in question. In Normandy, however, as there were no written memorials to appeal to, the record was merely an oral certificate made by those who had witnessed the transaction.

Loy apparissant.—In the Customary, c. 67, personal actions are divided into simple and criminal, and the latter are said to be determined by the *loy apparissant*. One kind of criminal suit is the “querelle de meurtre,” which is the same proceeding as the “appeal of murder” formerly known in this country. The “querelle de meurtre” was decided by the wager of battle, just as the appeal of murder used to be in this country. Hence it is clear that the *loy apparissant* meant trial by battle; and such is the construction which Blackstone has given to the phrase *lex manifesta* which occurs in Magna Charta.

Nullus Ballivus de cætero ponat aliquem ad *legem manifestam*, nec ad juramentum simplici loquelâ suâ sine testibus fidelibus, ad hoc inductis.

Loy prouable is said to be of two kinds, affirmative proof on oath, and denial on oath. The first mode of proceeding coincides with the trial by witnesses without jury, as it formerly existed in this country; the second mode is that styled in this country “Wager of Law.” The latter mode of trial was called in Normandy “Deraignement,” or “*loy de deresne*,” and it is defined in ch. 123, to be “a law established in Normandy whereby the defendant in a simple action shows that he has not done that wherewith his adversary charges him.”

Hence it would appear that the word *loy* was used to signify different modes of trial. But the *loy de deresne* seems to have been encumbered with the fewest formalities, and to have been the most popular with the people. It is accordingly termed in the Customary *simple loy*, and is occasionally expressed merely by the word *loy*: thus in ch. 123. it is said, “if the defendant denies that he ever made the engagement and offers to deraign himself of it, la lo doit estre gaigée, et terme mis à la faire.”

We see then that the term *wager of law* was known in Normandy as well as in this country. But in Normandy, as the term *law* was applied to several modes of trial, it was generally necessary to qualify it, when speaking of any one in particular. In this country the term was never permanently applied but to one species of trial, and consequently the phrase “wager of law” was used without any fear of ambiguity.

“On the Classification of the Chinese Roots.” By J. F. Davis, Esq.

In the fifteenth chapter of the author’s work on China, some mention is made of the 214 roots, or radical and original characters, under which the whole of the Chinese written language is arranged in the dictionaries. It is not easy to overrate the importance of these roots, when we consider that they enter into the composition, and influence the meaning, of every word in the language.

The late Professor Abel Rémusat of Paris remarked that, in addition to their uses in lexicographic arrangement, these roots singly represent or express the principal objects or ideas that men have occasion to communicate in the infancy of their knowledge ; comprising within their number the heads of genera and classes in nature, and thus affording the elements and means of a philosophic system of arrangement. A fortunate instinct led the framers of the language, instead of forming characters altogether new and arbitrary, to express new objects or ideas by the ingenious combination of those elementary symbols which they already possessed. Thus among the roots we find *horse*, *dog*, *metal*, &c., and the addition of some other significant symbol, expressive of some peculiar property or characteristic, serves to designate the different *species* comprised under these principal *genera*, as *horse-ass*, *horse-mule* ; *dog-wolf*, *dog-fox* ; *metal-iron*, *metal-silver*, &c., the elementary or generic words horse, dog, metal, being those under which the compounds are arranged in the dictionary.

The obvious analogy which this system (however imperfect in its details) bears to the principle of the Linnæan nomenclature, led M. Rémusat to classify that portion of the 214 roots, consisting of only about 30 in all, which had reference to genera in the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms. Whatever might be the results in a scientific point of view, and in regard to natural history, this sort of classification appeared to the author to possess considerable interest and utility on the score of general *philology*, and with a view to the particular study of the language in question. He had accordingly attempted to perform, for the whole 214 roots, what M. Rémusat did for that portion to which he confined his attention. In so doing, he had nearly retained M. Rémusat's classification under the heads of the three natural kingdoms, but extended the number to 33 roots ; and the following are (in the first place) the general heads under which the whole 214 roots seemed most readily to arrange themselves :—

	Classes.
Human kind, and its relations	14
Mammalia	8
Other animals	7
Vegetables	13
Minerals	5
Parts, &c. of animals	28
Other objects in nature	25
Objects in art	41
Numbers	5
Actions (verbs)	37
Qualities (adjectives)	30
	<hr/>
	213
Undefined	1
	<hr/>
	214

Whatever additional interest and importance the consequences of recent events may attach to the language of China on the score of utility

alone, its very singular structure entitles it to attention as a part of the history of the human mind, and of philology in general. He had accordingly been tempted to extend his examination, from the mere classification of the roots, to a computation of the proportion in which each separate root enters into the construction and arrangement of the whole language. The dictionary which he selected for this purpose contained about eleven thousand six hundred different words, the really useful and practical mass of the language; all beyond which is mere pedantry. The following tables exhibit each root arranged under its own particular class, and numbered on the left (for facility of reference) according to its numerical order in all the dictionaries, by which it may be immediately found in the tables of Morrison's dictionary. The column of figures on the right shows the total number of compound words to be found under each root in the dictionary examined by the author.

<i>Human kind and its relations.</i>		No.	Compounds.
No.	Compounds.		
9. Man.....	478	75. Tree, wood.....	493
10. (Another form)	24	97. Melon.....	16
33. Scholar, sage	10	115. Grain	144
38. Woman	243	118. Bamboo	200
39. Son	31	119. Rice	72
44. Corpse	39	140. Grass, herbs	470
48. Workman	7	151. Bean	16
49. Self	12	179. Onion	6
83. Family, kindred	3	199. Wheat	15
88. Father	3	200. Hemp.....	7
131. Minister, servant	4	202. Millet	6
132. Self	5		
158. Body, person	158	<i>Minerals.</i>	
194. Ghost, spirit	25	32. Earth	222
		96. Jade, gem	127
<i>Mammalia.</i>		112. Stone	135
93. Ox	54	167. Metal	207
94. Dog	136	197. Salt.....	4
123. Sheep	39		
141. Tiger	18	<i>Parts, &c. of Animals.</i>	
152. Hog.....	33	30. Mouth.....	437
187. Horse	127	58. Head of a hog	8
198. Deer.....	23	59. Variegated feathers	11
208. Mouse	21	61. Heart	467
		61. Hand	492
<i>Other Animals.</i>		29. (Another form)	21
142. Insect	225	82. Short hair, fur	30
153. Reptile	38	84. Breath.....	4
172. Birds	35	87. Nail	7
195. Fish.....	106	92. Teeth (incisores)	3
196. Large birds	160	104. Disease	192
205. Toad	13	107. Skin	13
213. Tortoise	5	109. Eye.....	186
		124. Feather	43
<i>Vegetables.</i>		126. Hair of the face	8
45. Bud	4	128. Ear	36
65. Branch.....	3	130. Flesh	222

No.	Compounds.	No.	Compounds.
135. Tongue.....	10	62. Lance	37
143. Blood	10	63. Inner door	16
148. Horn	31	67. Letters	6
157. Foot.....	155	68. Measure of capacity	10
176. Face.....	9	69. Measure of weight.....	15
181. Head	84	80. Separation, prohibition ...	7
185. (Another form)	2	98. Tiles	30
188. Bone	47	102. Field	16
190. Hair of the head	43	103. Measure of length	5
209. Nose.....	9	108. Dish	42
211. Teeth	37	110. Spear	8
<i>Other Objects in Nature.</i>		111. Arrow.....	18
3. Point	5	130. Silk	269
13. Wilderness	4	121. Pottery	20
15. Icicle	46	122. Net	35
17. Pit	6	127. Plough	16
22. Receptacle	19	129. Pencil.....	6
23. (Another form)	8	134. Mortar	16
27. Shelter.....	29	137. Boat	48
36. Evening	11	145. Garment.....	184
46. Hill	142	159. Wheel.....	127
47. Water-course	9	164. Wine	66
54. Journey	5	166. Chinese mile	5
72. Sun	154	169. Door	71
74. Moon	21	177. Leather undressed.....	73
85. Water	548	178. Dressed leather	24
86. Fire	200	192. Sacrificial wine	4
91. Splinter	14	193. Perfume pot	6
116. Cave.....	51	206. Tripod.....	4
150. Valley	11	207. Drain	8
154. Pearl	90	214. Wind instrument	4
163. Territory	88	<i>Numbers.</i>	
170. Mound.....	101	1. One.....	23
173. Rain.....	67	5. (Another form)	11
180. Sound	9	7. Two.....	12
182. Wind	23	12. Eight	15
212. Dragon* (fabulous).....	2	24. Tent†	18
<i>Objects in Art.</i>		<i>Actions (verbs).</i>	
16. Table	8	2. To descend	9
18. Knife, cutting instrument.	115	11. To enter	10
21. Spoon	9	14. To cover	15
26. Seal	19	20. To fold	17
31. Enclosure.....	45	25. To divine	7
41. Inch.....	17	34. To follow	3
50. Napkin	86	35. To walk slow	12
51. Shield	6	40. To collect	99
56. Dart.....	6	53. To protect	82
57. Bow	35	55. To join hands.....	14

* Heraldic symbol of the emperor, and a type of the watery element.

† All the other numerals (to nine inclusive) are derived from these, with the exception of four, and that was also, in its original form. The Chinese numerals 1, 2, 3, and 10, are the Roman numerals I., II., III., and X. turned the other way.

No.	Compounds.	No.	Compounds.
60. To pace	69	19. Strong.....	66
66. To touch lightly	70	28. Crooked	7
73. To say	14	37. Great	49
76. To owe.....	56	42. Little	11
77. To stop.....	19	43. Distorted.....	11
79. To kill	18	52. Slender	4
81. To compare	7	70. Square.....	29
89. To imitate	4	71. Defective.....	3
100. To produce, beget	6	78. Bad	53
101. To use	4	90. Inclining.....	7
105. To issue forth	3	95. Dark-coloured	3
111. To creep	4	99. Sweet	10
113. To admonish	97	106. White	29
117. To erect	26	125. Aged	8
136. To disturb	4	133. Extreme	5
144. To go	15	138. Disobedient	3
146. To overshadow	6	139. Coloured	4
247. To see	28	155. Red.....	10
149. To speak, express	373	160. Bitter	11
156. To walk	45	168. Long	2
161. To tremble	4	171. Reaching to	3
162. To walk swiftly	145	174. Green	8
165. To tear, pluck	4	175. False	10
183. To fly	3	186. Fragrant.....	10
184. To eat	90	189. High	4.
191. To fight	11	201. Yellow.....	8
204. To embroider	3	203. Black	26
<i>Qualities (adjectives).</i>		210. Even	5
4. Bent.....	16	<i>Undefined.</i>	
6. Hooked	5	132.	5

Some of the results of the preceding tables are curious, especially the disproportionate importance of different roots in the general construction of the language. It appears that of the total number of 11,600 words, no less than 8200 are comprised under only thirty-three roots, viz.—

	Compounds.
Man	478
Woman	243
Body.....	158
Mouth	437
Heart	467
Hand	492
Disease.....	192
Eye	186
Flesh	222
Foot.....	155
Dog	136
Horse	127
Insect	225
Fish.....	106
Bird	160
Tree, wood	493

	Compounds.
Grain	144
Bamboo	200
Grass, herbs.....	470
Jade, gem	127
Metals	207
Earth	222
Hill	142
Sun	154
Water	548
Fire	200
Mound.....	101
Knife, cutting instrument	115
Silk	269
Garment	184
Wheat	127
Speak	373
Walk swiftly	145

An extended analysis shows that the small proportion of only seven roots comprehend under them no less than 3385 words.

Man	478
Mouth	437
Heart	467
Hand	492
Tree, wood	493
Grass, herbs.....	470
Water	548

It is apparent that the bulk of these 214 roots, or primitive words, consist of nouns substantive, the names of the principal objects in nature or early art; and their *generic* character seemed to the author to corroborate the opinion of Dr. Adam Smith, in an essay concerning the first formation of languages, appended to his work on the "Theory of Moral Sentiments." He observes that the assigning particular names to denote particular objects, that is, the institution of nouns substantive, would probably be one of the first steps towards the formation of language. The objects most familiar to two aborigines would have particular names given to them, as *a cave, a tree, a river*. When they met with other objects, altogether similar to these, they would give the same names rather than invent new ones; and thus these words, which were originally the proper names of individuals, would each of them become the common name of a multitude or class. It is this application of the name of an individual to a great multitude of similar objects that seems to have given occasion to the early formation of those comprehensive classes which we call *genera*. With the progress of knowledge, the necessity for particularising and distinguishing led to the construction of those thousands of compound words or characters which the Chinese ingeniously formed by the combinations of the simple roots, and which are arranged under the roots in their dictionaries as *species* under *genera*. We may add that the same principle seems to have

been finally extended by them, from sensible objects to abstract ideas.

On the reading of this paper a lengthened discussion arose as to the inferences to be drawn from some of its statements, and more particularly on the question, whether the roots of language were likely to have an abstract or a concrete meaning.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

MARCH 10, 1843.

No. 6.

The Rev. Dr. MILL in the Chair.

The following communications were read :—

“On the derivatives of the Welsh word *gwy*.” By the late Rev. John Walters*, Rector of Landough, Glamorganshire. Communicated by the Rev. John Jones (Tegid).

Gwy, a flow, a flood, is seldom if ever used in modern Welsh, except as the name of a river, or in composition. *Gŵy* is the Welsh name of the Wye; *Cynwy* (Conway) means the chief river; *Elwy* (Eilwy) the second river; *Dowrddwy* (Dwrddwy) the noisy river†; *Mynwy* (Mainwy) the small river; *Llugwy*, the clear river, &c. The name of the river *Towy* Mr. Walters considered as formed from the same root, with the addition of the prefix *ty*.

Gwyo, to flow, is also obsolete; but it has left verbal substantives behind it—*Gwyad* (gwaed) blood, and *gwyath* (contractedly *gwyth*), an influx, a canal. The channel between the Isle of Wight and the mainland was anciently called *yr wyth*, the channel, and the island itself *ynys yr wyth*, the channel island. Hence came the Latin name of Vectis, and the English name of Wight. One of the Cornish hundreds, which lies at the head of a large bay, is called *Pen-wyth*, that is, Bay-head. Again, *amwyth* means a surrounding channel, a moat; and Shrewsbury, which is nearly surrounded by the Severn, is called *Tref amwythig*‡, the moated town.

Among the other derivatives of *Gwy* are *gwyach* (equivalent to *gwyog*), a king-fisher—*ceyx* Latin, *κηξ* Greek; *Giach*, a snipe; *gwy-ydd* (contractedly *gŵydd*), a goose; *gwyar*, blood, &c.

“On certain Inflexions of the Old-English Adjective.” By Edwin Guest, Esq.

The Anglo-Saxon, like the Greek and Latin, often distinguishes number, case and person, by a change in the vowel of the final syllable; in the Old-English these vowels are all confounded; and in our modern English they are lost. Thus the Anglo-Saxon *ath*

* Author of an English-Welsh Dictionary, 4to. London, 1794.

† Mr. Jones considers this to be a “fanciful” derivation. He observes that the *Dwrddwy* (the English Dee) is joined by another river soon after it leaves the Bala Lake; and that the country people consider the name to signify Two-Rivers—*dwr*, a stream, and *dwy*, two.

‡ Or simply *Amwythig*.

has *athes* in the genitive singular, and *athas* in the nominative plural: the Old-English *oth* has *othas* for both cases; and *othas* is now represented by a monosyllable—*oaths*. Again, the Anglo-Saxon *athe* is the dative singular, and *atha* the genitive plural: both these cases are represented by the Old-English *othe*; and our modern dialect, having lost the vowel of the final syllable, has no means of distinguishing these inflected cases from the nominative *oath*. Again, *lufian*, to love, has *lufath* for the third person singular, and *lafiath* for the three persons plural; the Old-English has *loveth* in both numbers; and for the third person singular our peasantry now say *lovth**.

It is obvious that either of these changes (and more especially the first) must have brought with it a new dialect. The confounding of the vowels of the final syllable was a confusion of number, case and person—in short, of those grammatical forms, to which language owes its precision and its clearness. To prevent ambiguity, the speaker made the prepositions do the work of the lost inflexions, and habitually employed other modes of speech, which had hitherto been little, if at all, in use. These new forms were both curious and prominent features of the new dialect, but they were not its *essential* characteristic. The only sure text, which will enable us to distinguish an Old-English from an Anglo-Saxon MS., is a confounding of the vowels of the final syllable.

After this definition of our Old-English dialect, we proceed to lay before the reader the common (or as they are sometimes called, the indefinite) inflexions of the Old-English adjective. The adjective declined is *god*, good:—

Singular.			Plural.
m.	f.	n.	m. f. n.
N. god	god	god	gode.
G. godes	godre	godes	godre.
D. goden	godre	goden	goden.
A. godne	gode	god	gode.

All these inflexions may be found in the MSS. of the thirteenth century; but there is much inconsistency in the manner of using them, and that sometimes even in the same MS. The only inflexions which survived long enough to affect the language of Chaucer and his contemporaries, were those of the nominative and genitive plural. To these we shall for the present confine our observations.

In the latter half of the fourteenth century our adjectives took the inflexion of the genitive plural only when they followed the genitive plural of the personal pronouns:—

* This inflexion is now only found west of the Parret,—Jennins, West. Dial.; but within the last three centuries it was used all over the South of England, and in *both* numbers. Those poets of the 16th century who were West-of-England men, almost invariably elided the vowel—*showth*, *leapth*, &c.—just as the Somersetshire peasant does at the present day. The men of the North, in whose *spoken* dialect this inflexion was unknown, generally took it in its uncontracted form from the pages of Chaucer.

1. Strokes of michel might
 Thai delten hem betvene
 That thurch hir brinies bright
 Her bother blode was sene. Sir Tristr. 3. 8.
2. The kyng and Roberd his brother, *her beyre* poer nome
 And wyth gret ost and strengthe ynou to Engelond come. Rob. Glou. 2. 388.
3. Tho hii come to Guldeforde thys erle Godwyne the ssrewe
 Lete thys gultelese men sette al arewe
 And telle out euere the tethe man and the nyne thoru out he nome.
 And let smyte of *her alre* heuedys. Rob. Glou. 1. 327.
4. And right so by *theire aller* dome
 Thai made him emperoure of Rome. Sevyn Sages. 2828.
5. A morwe whan the day began to spring
 Uprose our hoste, and was *our aller* cok. Chau. Prol.

Her bother blode, ex. 1, means the blood of them both, and *her beyre poer*, ex. 2, the power of them both—*beyre* being the genitive plural of the Old-English *bey*, both. In like manner *her alre heuedys* means the heads of them all, *theire aller dome* the judgment of them all, and *our aller* cok* the cook of us all.

Scotch writers of the fifteenth century sometimes added to these plural genitives the genitival ending *is* :—

6. The lordis gawe assent thare til
 And ordanyt wyth *thaire allaris* will
 That, &c. Wynt. 8. 35, 178.
7. I sall reuenge and end *our alleris* offence. Gaw. Dougl. Virgil, p. 406.

See other examples in Jam. Dict., under *Allaris* and *Alleris*.

This double inflexion is still used in the genitive plural of our personal pronouns *ours*, *yours*, *theirs*, and is also found in the Danish and the Swedish—*våras* Sw., *vores* Dan., ours; *deras* Sw., *deres* Dan., theirs. It is not easy to say when these forms first made their appearance in our written language, but they were common in the fourteenth century, when they may have been introduced from some of our Northern dialects.

The Anglo-Saxon *ure* and *eower* were sometimes considered as the plural genitives of the first and second persons; and sometimes took the inflexions of the adjective, and became for all purposes possessive, or (as sometimes termed) adjectival pronouns. Our modern grammarians pronounce *ours* and *yours* to be genitives, and

* The genitive *aller*, further corrupted into *alder*, was used as late as the sixteenth century in the compounds *alder-best*, *alder-liefest*, &c. Vid. 2. H. 6. 1. 1. These compounds are met with in great numbers in the Low-Dutch, and are not unfrequent in the High-Dutch, or German. Vid. *allerhöchst*, *allerheiligst*, &c.

our and *your* adjectival pronouns ; but if we examine our literature, we shall find the only difference in the use of these forms to be, that *ours*, *yours*, *theirs*, &c. are only used absolutely, that is, without a substantive, while *our*, *your*, *their*, &c. are found not only before substantives, but also in every construction which admits the pronouns with the double inflexion. In some constructions the analogies of language would lead us to consider these pronouns as genitive cases, and in others as adjectival pronouns ; but for the most part they may be classed as either,—the adjectival inflexions whose presence or absence once fixed their character having long since disappeared.

In the following examples *our*, *your*, &c. are used absolutely :—

8. Gif he passeth with honour—
Oure is the deshonour. Kyng Alisaunder, 3867.

9. Oure kyng hath this freke y felde—
Oure is the maistry of the felde. Kyng Alis. 1262.

10. Y kepe nought bote honour—
Al the bygate schul be *your*. Kyng Alis. 2138.

11. Many Sarezyns hadden her fyn
And wenten to Mahoun and Apollyn,
And tho that caugte deth of *our*
Wenten to Crist our Saveoure.
Rich. Coer de Lion, 4997.

12. And when the tilieris sighen him, they thoughten withinne hem-
self and seiden this is the eir, sle we him, that the eritage be *our*.—
Wicl. Luc. 20.

13. . . . and ye vouchesauf to techen me
This noble craft, and this subtiltee,
I wol be *your* in al that ever I may.
Chau. Chan. Yem. Tale.

14. Ye fathers and ye mothers eke also
Though ye han children, be it on or mo
Your is the charge of all her surveance, &c.
Chau. Doctoures Tale.

15. Of Synah can I tell thee more
And of our Lady's bow'r
But little needs to strow my store,
Suffice this hill of *our*. Spens. July.

In ex. 11 *our* is an adjectival pronoun, but in the last example it seems to be a genitive governed* by the preposition *of*, which it may be observed sometimes governs that case in the Anglo-Saxon. The character of a genitive occasionally assumed by these pro-

* That the Old-English *of* did sometimes govern a genitive, will, I think, appear from the following examples :—

Thus thise dragouns with thise knightes
Foughten two tides of the *nightes*. Kyng Alisaunder, 5227.

. . . . Maximus, that was an officere
Of the *Prefectes*, and his corniculere.—
Chau. Second Nonnes Tale.

of the *n* declension, of which we shall have to speak in the sequel. They are to be met with in the literature of the fourteenth century:—

19. Blessyd be poure men in spirit, for the kyngdom of hevenes is *herun*.—Wiclif. Matt. 5.

20. And some of *ouren* wenten to the graue and thei foundun so as the wymmen seiden, but thei foundun not hym.—Wicl. Luc. 24.

The inflexion of the genitive plural was only occasionally used, and affected only particular adjectives; but the use of the plural inflexion *e* is so general in our Old-English MSS., that whenever an uninflected adjective is joined to a plural substantive, the exception ought always to be noticed, and if possible explained. The ending *e* is found in all the cases of the plural, but in our southern MSS. the genitive and dative often take their proper inflexions—at least during the thirteenth century. In most of the following examples, the adjective will be found both in the plural and in the singular number, and consequently both with and without the inflexion:—

21. In these lay a gret multitude of *syke* men, *blinde* crokid and *drye*.—Wicl. Jon. 5.

22. In all the orders foure is non that can
So much of dalliance and *faire* language,
He hadde ymade ful many a marriage—
His tippet was ay farsed ful of knives,
And pinnes for to given *faire** wives. Chau. Prol.

23. And *al* the cuntre of Judee wente out to him, and *alle* men of Jerusalem.—Wiclif, Mark 1.

24. He ghyueth lyf to *alle* men and brething and *alle* thingis, and made of oon *al* the kynde of men to inhabit on *al* the face of the erthe.—Wiclif, Dedis of Apostlis, 17.

25. That fadres sone which *alle* thinges wrought;
And *all*, that wrought is with a skilful thought,
The Gost that from the fader gan procede
Hath souled hem. Chau. The Second Nonnes Tale.

26. And *alle* we that ben in this aray
And maken *all* this lamentation,
We losten *alle* our husbondes at that toun.
Chau. The Knightes Tale.

27. A *good* man bryngeth forth *gode* thingis of *good* tresoure.—Wiclif, Matt. 12.

28. So every *good* tre maketh *gode* fruytis, but an yvel tre maketh yvel† fruytis. A *good* tree may not mak yvel fruytis, neither an yvel tree may make *gode* fruytis. Every tree that maketh not *good* fruyt schal be cut down.—Wiclif, Matt. 7.

* This word *fair-e* is certainly a dissyllable, and the other *faire* as clearly a monosyllable. Tyrwhitt spells them both alike, but he had not the least notion of the adjectival inflexions. A *good* MS. would no doubt distinguish between the two.

† After one of the liquids Wiclif often rejects the vowel of the final syllable. He sometimes writes *camels*, *castels*, *vessels*, &c. for *camelis*, *castelis*, *vesselis*, &c., and in the text he has written *yvel* for *yuele*. In like manner the Germans decline *himmel*, gen. *himmels*, dat. *himmel*, instead of *himmeles* and *himmele*.

29. Men loveden more derknessis than light for her werkes weren *yuele*, for ech man that doeth *yvel*, hateth the light.—Wiclif, Jon. 3.

30. And *othere* seedis felden among thornes and thornes wexen up and strangliden hem, and *othere* seedis felden into good lond and gaven fruyt, sum an hundred fold, *another* sixty fold, an *other* thritty fold, &c.—Wiclif, Matt. 13.

31. Yet the while he spake to the puple lo *his* mother and *hise* brethren stonden withoute forth.—Wiclif, Matt. 12.

32. And *hise* disciplis camen and token *his* body.—Wiclif, Matt. 14.

33. Whan *thise* Bretons tuo were fled out of *this* lond
Ine toke his feaute of alle, &c. Rob. Brunne, p. 3.

34. *This* is thilk disciple that bereth witnessyng of *these* thingis and wroot hem.—Wicl. Jon. 21.

35. Seye to us in what power thou doist *these* thingis, and who is he that gaf to thee *this* power.—Wicl. Luk. 20.

This, in the Anglo-Saxon, has for its plural *thas*, and in our Southern dialect also it generally remains a monosyllable, but in the Northern dialect it was almost always inflected. (Ex. 33, 34, 35.) So likewise *his*, in the Anglo-Saxon and in the Old-English Southern dialect, is a genitive; but in the Northern dialect it is often inflected, like the other adjectival pronouns. (Ex. 31, 32.) Again, in the Anglo-Saxon and the Old-English, the past participle was sometimes inflected in the plural, and sometimes not; and the same observation applies to adjectives, which stand in the place of the passive participle, as—

wolcnu—*wann* with winde
clouds—wan-coloured with wind. Cæd. 12.

Hence we need not be surprised at finding *blesseyd* (Ex. 19) and *crokid* (Ex. 21) without inflexion. There are also certain adjectives, which enter very freely into composition, and of course remain uninflected, when the compound is in the plural number. As the elements of a compound are often written separately both in the Anglo-Saxon and the Old-English, we should always be on our guard against the errors which may arise from *this* source. When the number of these rules shall have been increased by a more careful study of our Old-English dialects, we shall probably be able to explain most of the cases in which the uninflected adjective is joined to the plural substantive. We must however make some allowance for the blunders of the copyist (particularly during the fourteenth century), and too frequently also for the ignorance of the editor. Many an Old-English MS. has been “corrected” till every trace of inflexion has disappeared.

Besides the declension we have been noticing, the Gothic dialects possessed (and many of them still possess) a second declension of the adjective, which has been called *the definite*. It was used when the adjective followed the definite article, a definitive or possessive pronoun, or a genitive case. The Anglo-Saxons moreover used it when addressing an individual, and also to express the excess of any

quality—for which purpose we now use the definite article, as “Alfred *the* good king.” In our Old-English dialect, the definite adjective was declined as follows:—

Singular.			Plural.
m.	f.	n.	m. f. n.
N. gode	gode	gode	goden.
G. goden	goden	goden	godene.
D. goden	goden	goden	goden.
A. goden	goden	gode	gode.

In our Southern dialect this declension seems to have been pretty generally followed during the thirteenth century. But MSS. written in our Northern and Eastern counties use the inflexion *e* in *all* the cases, and from the earliest period; and in the fourteenth century, the inflexion *en* is only occasionally met with even in our Southern MSS.

36. Thereto he was *the semelieste* man
That is or was, sithen the world began.
Ch. Manciples Prol.

37. *The nexte* houre of Mars folwing this
Arcite unto the temple walked is.
Ch. Knightes Tale.

38. And hom she goth anon *the nexte* way.
Ch. Knightes Tale.

39. But in *the sixte* monethe the aungel Gabriel was sent from God.—
Wicl. Luk. 1.

40. After *the thridde* day thei foundun him in the temple.—Wicl. Luk. 3.

41. How may any man entre into the hous of a *strong* man, and take awei
his vessels but first he bynde *the stronge* man, &c.—Wicl. Matt. 12.

42. God save you, that bought agen mankind
And you amend, thus said *this olde* man.
Ch. Pardoneres Tale.

43. Hire eyen caste she ful low adoun
Ther Pluto hath *his derke* region.
Ch. Knightes Tale.

44. the yonge sunne
Hath in the ram *his halfe* cours yronne. Ch. Prol.

In the following examples, the definite adjective is used to denote the excess of some quality, or else by way of address:—

45. But *highe* God sometime senden can
His grace unto a litel oxes stall.
Ch. Clerkes Tale.

46. What axist thou me of *good* thing ther is oo *goode* God.—Wicl.
Matt. 19.

47. And lo oon cam and seide to him *gode* maistir, what *good* schal I
do that I have everlastynge lyf? whiche seith to him, what axist thou me
of *good* thing.—Wicl. Matt. 19.

48. Now *good* Sire, go forth thy way and hie the.
Ch. Chan. Yemannes Tale.

The inflexions of the definite adjectives are those of the masculine, feminine and neuter substantives of the *n* declension; and the general characteristic of this declension is, that the nominative ends in a vowel, and most of the other cases in *n*. In the Southern counties, the Old-English *ore*, an ox, had *oren* not only for its nominative plural, but also for its genitive, dative and accusative singular. The Old-English genitive in *en* seems to have left traces behind it in some of our compounds, for instance in *nightin-gale**; and its inflexion most probably gave their ending to the doubly inflected pronouns, *our'n*, *your'n*, *his'n*, &c.

The *n* declension, more or less developed, makes its appearance in many of the Indo-European languages, besides the Gothic. With some exceptions the nominative ends in a vowel, and *n* is found in the other cases. The Greek affords us the most remarkable exception to the rule, for in that language all these substantives end their nominatives in *ν*, thus affording us a striking contrast with the Latin, λέων *leo*, δράκων *draco*, Μακεδών *Macedo*, &c. The Anglo-Saxon affords us some few instances of nouns which, like the Greek, take the *n* in their nominative, as *deman*, Cæd. 229, *Sarran*, Cæd. 109; and we need not therefore feel surprise, if sometimes the Old-English definite adjective takes *en* as a nominative ending. It is however remarkable that our Northern dialects, which so early rejected the *regular* definite declension, not unfrequently afford us instances of this curious anomaly.

The following examples belong to the thirteenth century:—

49. ure laferd crist that naggled wass o rode
 Thurrh that *iudisskenn* hæfedd-folc that he wass borenn offe.
 Our Lord Christ that nail'd was on the rood
 By that Jewish tribe, whereof he was born. Ormulum.
50. He strahte scaft stærne *stithimoden* king!
 He levelled the strong shaft stern-hearted king!
 Layamon.
51. Fader god of alle thinge
Almightin† louerd hegest kinge.
 Corp. Christ. MSS. R. 11. l. 28.

In Ex. 48, *enn* must be considered as an essential part of the definite adjective *iudisskenn*, and not the regular inflexion of the definite declension, because in the first place Ormin does not use the inflexion *enn*, and secondly, because the proper inflexion would be *e*, not *enn*, as *folc* is neuter. In Anglo-Saxon the phrase would be, *thurh that iudisce heafod-folc*. In Ex. 51 *almightin* appears to be the definite form of the Old-English adjective *almight*.

* The Anglo-Saxon *niht* does not belong to the *n* declension; but many Old-English substantives took inflexions which were unknown to their Anglo-Saxon prototypes.

† In the same poem we have *almightin* used as a substantive—the Almighty.
 Than sal him almighti luven
 Her benethen and thund abuen. 1. 9.

When an adjective qualifies a personal pronoun in Anglo-Saxon, it generally takes the indefinite declension; but it is also sometimes found in its definite form, as *ic selfa*, I myself, *thu selfa*, thou thyself, &c. By substituting *en* for the vowel ending, we see the origin of those curious Old-English forms, *myselfen*, *thyselven*, *himselfen*, &c.

52. I wol *myselfen* gladly with you ride
Right at min owen coste, and be your gide. Ch. Prol.

53. Than sal thou *thiselven* se
Wha have the wrang, thi wif or he.
Sevyn Sages, 2899.

54. . . . he wol make him doten anon right
But it a fend be as *himselfen* is.
Ch. Chanones Yemannes Tale.

55. Qwhy couth he nocht have in to pes
Haldyn his land, as it than wes,
And *hym selwyn* owt of daungere. Wynt. 8. 40.

Himsen (contracted from *himselfen*) was used by Clare, the Northamptonshire poet; and *mysen* is still used in Craven. Vid. Cars. Crav. Dial. *sen*.

All the inflexions we have hitherto noticed may be traced, mediately or immediately, to the Anglo-Saxon; but that which we have now to treat of has not been met with in that dialect of our language, though it may probably be found in it. Our Northern MSS. not unfrequently assign to the plural adjective and participle the inflexion *es*. There is nothing exactly parallel to this in the other Gothic dialects. But as in the Icelandic we find the substantival inflexions *ir*, *ar*, representing our common plural inflexion *es* or *s*—as *hvalir*, whales, *trëllar*, thralls, &c.—so the adjectival inflexions *ir*, *ar* may represent this plural inflexion of our adjective:—

	masc.	fem.	neut.
Nom. Pl.	godhir	gôdhar	gôdh.

The plural inflexion of the feminine adjective in Mæso-gothic is *ôs* which approaches the English inflexion more nearly—

	masc.	fem.	neut.
Nom. Pl.	godai	godôs	goda.

56. Ah godd ealles te *godes* briddes of heouene.
But God calls the good birds of heaven, &c.
Inst. Mon. Titus, D. 18. p. 37.

57. Thir er *fues* nobil besaundes.
That our lorde be taught his servaundes.
Medit. Hiltoni Faust. B. 6. fol. 119 b.

58. Unces grete and leopardes
Youen hem many assaut *hardes*,
And slowghen many bolde and *wighthes*
Of King Alisaunder knightes. Kyng Alisaunder, 5230.

59. The King there les twenty knighttes
And on and thritty of sergeauntz *wighttes*. Ib. 5355.

60. Wel sore anoyed was the kyng
For he seygh his stedes *honestes*
Dromedaries and other bestes
To forne his eighen steruen for thurst—
Of al pyne that was hym werst. Kyng Alisaunder, 5056.
61. In the londe, als I fynde of Ynde
Ben cites fyue thousynde
Withouten ydles and castels,
And boroughs tounes swithe *feles*. Ib. 4841.
62. Thou schalt fynde trowes* two
Seyntes and holy they buth bo. Ib. 6763.
63. Erles and barouns and alle thay
Sayde " We ben at on accord
To wende with thee Richard our Lord "
Quod the kyng " Frenedes gromercy
It is our honour, lystenes why,
Wendes and graunts the Pope his boon
As other *Crystenens* kyngs have done."
Rich. Coer de Lion, 1374.
64. For Rome quhilum sa hard wes stad,
Qnhen Hanniball thaim wencusyt had,
That off ryngis with rich stanyis
That war of knyghtis fyngyris *taneys*
He send thre bollis to Cartage. The Bruce, 2. 605.

This curious inflexion of the adjective long kept its ground in the language of Law and Ceremony. Its resemblance to the plural inflexion of the French and Latin adjective seems to have been the cause.

65. The landes of the Mallettes of Yorkshire, by sales and *heirs generales* be sore disparkelid.—Leland's Itinerary, 6. 27.

66. Here foloweth undre correccion a little devyse for the coronacion of the most high mighty and cristen prince Henry the VIIth, &c., by the hole assent of the *lordis spirituellis* and *temporellis* and also of all the comons of the land electe—to be king of the same.—Rutland Papers, p. 2.

67. I am denyde to sue my liuerie here,
And yet my *letters patents* give me leave.
Rich. 2. 1. 2.

These phrases have close resemblance to others which still survive, and to which they probably gave rise. In the fourteenth century it was not unusual to qualify one substantive with another, the qualifying substantive always following the substantive qualified.

68. But who that knowlechith me and my wordis in this *generacioun avoutresse* and synful also mannys sone schal knowleche him when he schal come in the glorie of his fadir with his aungels.—Wiclif. Mark 8.

When the substantive qualified was put in the plural, the qualifying substantive was generally made to agree with it in number:—

* i. e. trees.

69. Yet saw I brent the *shippes hoppesteres*
 The hunte ystrangled with the wilde beres, &c.
 Ch. Knightes Tale.

But neverthelesse suffiseth to the these trewe conclusyons in Englishe, as well as suffiseth to these noble *clerkes Grekes* these same conclusions in Greke.—Chaucer. The Conclusions of the Astrolabie.

70. And hou herden we ech man his language in which we ben borun—of Parthi and Medi—and *comelinges romaines*, and iewis, &c.—Wiclif, Dedis of Apostlis.

71. for the wolles of England
 Susteineth the *commons Flemings*, I understand.
 Hachluyt's Voy. England's Policie.

72. Yea thou mayest observe (friendly reader) what privileges the Danish king Canutus obtained at Rome, for our English *merchants adventurers* of those times.—Hachluyt, Voy. Preface, 2nd Ed.

73. On the left wing likewise there stood fast to the phalangites aforesaid, 1500 *horsemen Gallo-Grecians*.—Holland's Livy, p. 776.

Shippes hoppesteres, ex. 69, means the dancing ships—*hoppestere*, as Tyrwhitt observed, being a female dancer; and *comelinges romaines*, ex. 70, means Roman strangers. Under this class of idioms must be ranged the phrases *Knights-Templars*, *Knights-Hospitallers*, *Friars-Minors*, &c.

Before we close the paper, it may be well to call the reader's attention to a form which is now obsolete, and appears never to have been otherwise than local, but which in a philological point of view is curious and interesting. The North-country relative *quhilk* generally became *quhilkis* when it referred to a plural or collective substantive.

74. And bath the eldys has tane end
 As in all storys welle is kende
 Contenand hale thre thowsand yhere
 Nyne scowre and foure ourpassyt clere
 The *quhilkys* as Orosius
 Intyl his Cornyclis tellys us
 Nere foryhet ware, &c. Wynt. 2. Prol.

75. Above the commoun nature and conditioun of doggis, *quhilkis* are sene in al partis, are three maner of doggis in Scotland.

Bellenden, Descr. of Albion, c. ix.

76. Touching the kyndis of versis, *quhilks* are not cuttit, or broken, but alyke many feite in everie lyne of the verse, and how they are commonlie namit.—King James, Reulis and Cautelis of Scott. Poetry.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

MARCH 24, 1843.

No. 7.

Professor WILSON in the Chair.

Professor F. Bopp of Berlin, and Professor James Grimm of Berlin, were elected Honorary Members of the Society.

G. J. Pennington, Esq., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and the Rev. John E. Kempe, M.A., Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, were elected Members of the Society.

A paper was read, contributed by Fras. W. Newman, Esq., "On Scythia and the surrounding Countries, according to Herodotus."

The problem is, first, rightly to limit Scythia by the various nations which Herodotus places round it; next to determine the rivers and other interior divisions marked by him.

The nations bounding Scythia are the following:—(1) the Getae, south of the Danube; (2) the Agathyrsans on the river Maris, the modern Morosk, so that they were separated from Scythia by the Carpathian Mountains; (3) the Neurians divided from Scythia by the "great lake out of which the river Tyras flowed" (Her. iv. 51), probably an overflowing of the Dniester some way below its source, so that the Neurians may be safely placed in Volhynia; (4) the Androphagi, or Cannibals, a word perhaps denoting nothing more than their military prowess, probably between the Pripet and the Dnieper; (5) the Melanchlaeni, or Black Cloaked Men, due north of the Royal Scythians, and probably in the government of Orlov; (6) east, or south-east of these, the Budinians; (7) south of the Budinians, the Sarmatians, on the eastern side of the Tanais; (8) finally at the south-eastern side a corner was cut off by the Taurians; this was the Crimea, or a part of it.

Herodotus seems not to have known that the Crimea was a peninsula. He describes it as an *ἀκρῆ*, a projecting wedge-shaped piece of land. What he calls "the Rugged Peninsula" (iv, 99), seems to have been the eastern peninsula on which was the city Pantacapaëum. "The Moat" (cc. 3 and 20), reaching from the Mæotis to the Tauric Mountains, must have been cut on the Isthmus of the eastern peninsula; for the Tauric Mountains run along the south-eastern coast; and the moat was said to have been dug to stop the Scythians who desired to return from Asia into Europe. The Royal Scythians possessed the north-east coast of the Crimea; for their territory came down to the moat (c. 20); and we are told also of Scythians who lived "within the moat" (c. 28), i.e. upon

This must be computed from the Moat on the Rugged Peninsula, which he held to be the southern point of the Royal Scythians' territory. The latitude of this point is about $45\frac{1}{4}^{\circ}$; so that if we were to count his 4000 stadia as six degrees of latitude, we should be carried only to $51\frac{1}{4}^{\circ}$ north latitude. In the real journey the traveller would have to deviate greatly from the straight line; so that if we fix the northern frontier between 51° and 52° north latitude, the objection is more to be feared that it is more than Herodotus allows than that it is less.

In the latter part of the paper Mr. Newman endeavoured to account for the three rivers which Herodotus describes as east of the Borysthenes, and especially for the Hypacyris and Gerrhus, which are said to join their streams, and flow into the Euxine near the city Carcinitis. He conjectured that the Desna, which flows into the Dnieper, and the Seim which flows into the Desna, were taken to be the upper part of the Borysthenes; and that the Gerrhus, which is said to be parted off from the Borysthenes (*ἀπὸσχίσται*, c. 56), is the Oskol which rises near the Seim, and flows to the south, and the distance between which and the lower Dnieper corresponds to the seventeen days' journey, which Herodotus places between the Borysthenes and the Gerrhus in the lower part of their course. If the Oskol is supposed to be the Gerrhus, the Donetz, into which it flows, is of course the Hypacyris; and the assertion that it entered the Euxine will be an error. But whatever hypothesis be made about the correspondence of modern rivers with those described by Herodotus, this error will remain the same; for no considerable river enters the Black Sea in the Gulf of Perekop; and the structure of the country seems to make it impossible that any should ever have flowed in that direction.

The paper was accompanied by two manuscript maps, one of which represented the real features of the country with the ancient names placed according to Mr. Newman's theory; the other was a map according to the idea formed by Herodotus.

After the reading of the paper a discussion arose upon the ethnological relations of the Scythians. It was suggested that the distinct testimony of Herodotus, that the language of the Scythians was akin to that of the Sarmatians, and the evidence which tends to show that the Sarmatians are the stock of the Slavonic nations of modern Europe, are irreconcilable with the opinion deduced by Niebuhr from the description given by Hippocrates of the physical peculiarities of the Scythians, that they were a Mongolian tribe.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

APRIL 7, 1843.

No. 8.

Professor MALDEN in the Chair.

The Numismatic Chronicle, No. XX., was laid on the table,—presented by the Numismatic Society; also Letters on the Analogia Linguae Græcæ, &c., by James Tate, M.A., late Head-master of the Grammar-school, Richmond, presented by the author.

The following communication was then read:—

“On Plato’s Number.” By the Rev. J. W. Donaldson.

There is, perhaps, no single passage in the whole range of Greek authors which has given so much trouble to commentators, or has been subjected to so much special investigation, as Plato’s description of the Number on which would depend the better and worse generations in his imaginary republic. From Cicero’s time* to the present the obscurity of this passage has been proverbial: and though more than one distinguished scholar has lately examined it with all the appliances of modern learning, it seems to be still the prevailing opinion that we have not yet arrived at a satisfactory result.

In the course of an inquiry into the meaning of the passage, it will be convenient to consider as separate questions:—(I.) What is the signification of the Greek words as they stand; (II.) What is the number in question, and what are the arithmetical combinations implied; and (III.) What was Plato’s object and meaning in introducing this calculation into his Dialogue on the State.

I. The passage with which we are concerned stands thus in Plato’s own words, *De Republ.* p. 546: Χαλεπὸν μὲν κινηθῆναι πόλιν οὕτω ξυστάσαν· ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ γενομένῳ παντὶ φθορά ἐστίν, οὐδ’ ἡ τοιαύτη ξύστασις τὸν ἅπαντα μενεῖ χρόνον, ἀλλὰ λυθήσεται. λύσις δὲ ἥδε· οὐ μόνον φυτοῖς ἐγγείοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἐπιγείοις ζώοις φορὰ καὶ ἀφορία ψυχῆς τε καὶ σωμάτων γίνονται, ὅταν περιτροπαὶ ἐκάστοις κύκλων περιφορὰς ξυνάπτωσι, βραχυβίοις μὲν βραχυπόρους, ἐναντίοις δὲ ἐναντίας. γένους δὲ ὑμετέρου εὐγονίας τε καὶ ἀφορίας, καίπερ ὄντες σοφοὶ οὐς ἡγεμόνας πόλεως ἐπαιδεύσασθε, οὐδὲν μᾶλλον λογισμῷ μετ’ αἰσθήσεως τεύζονται, ἀλλὰ πάρεσιν αὐτοῦς καὶ γεννήσουσι παῖδας ποτε οὐδέον. ἔστι δὲ θείῳ μὲν γεννητῷ περίοδος ἣν ἀριθμὸς περιλαμβάνει τέλειος, ἀνθρωπεῖ δὲ ἐν ᾧ πρώτῳ αὐξήσεις δυνάμεναί τε καὶ δυναστευόμεναι τρεῖς ἀποστάσεις τέτταρας δὲ ὅρους λαβοῦσαι ὁμοιούντων τε καὶ ἀνομοιούντων καὶ αὐξόντων καὶ φθινόντων πάντα προσήγορα καὶ ῥητὰ πρὸς ἀλληλα ἀπέφηναν· ὧν ἐπίτριτος πυθμὴν πεμπάδι συζυγεῖς δύο ἁρμονίας παρέχεται τρεῖς αὐξήθεις, τὴν μὲν ἴσην ἰσάκεις ἑκατὸν

* Ad Attic. vii. 13 b. numero Platonis obscurius.

τοσαυτάκις, τὴν δὲ ἰσομήκη μὲν τῇ, προμήκη δὲ, ἑκατὸν μὲν ἀριθμῶν ἀπὸ διαμέτρων ῥητῶν πεμπάδος δεομένων ἐνὸς ἐκάστων, ἀρρήτων δὲ δυεῖν, ἑκατὸν δὲ κύβων τριάδος. ζύμπας δὲ οὗτος ἀριθμὸς γεωμετρικὸς, τοιούτου κύριος, ἀμεινόνων τε καὶ χειρόνων γενεσέων.

Such are the words of Plato, which seem to be correctly written. Let us now proceed to examine them at length as far as the number is described in them. The θεῖον γεννητὸν is "the world"—as Plutarch expressly says, when quoting this passage (*De Anim. Procr. in Tim.* p. 1017 C. p. 142. Wyttenb.): οὐκ ἄλλο καλῶν θεῖον γεννητὸν ἢ τὸν κόσμον. Consequently, the ἀνθρώπειον γεννητὸν is either "man" himself, or "the commonwealth," of which the philosopher is speaking. The ἀριθμὸς τέλειος is "a number which is equal to the sum of its parts." Euclid, lib. vii. defin. 22: Τέλειος ἀριθμὸς ἐστίν, ὁ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μέρεσιν ἴσος ὢν. Plutarch, *u. s.* p. 1018 C. (p. 145. Wyttenb.): καὶ ἐστίν ὁ μὲν εἴς τέλειος, ἴσος ὢν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μέρεσι. See also Euclid ix. prop. 36. The epithet πρῶτος indicates that the number in question is the *πυθμὴν* or base of the whole calculation. The word αὐξήσις means "the multiplication of a number by itself;" it is the act of which the result is αὐξή, and this corresponds as nearly as possible to our mathematical term "dimension." Thus, Plato, *De Republ.* vii. p. 528 A.: νῦν δὲ γὰρ οὐκ ὀρθῶς τὸ ἐξῆς ἐλάβομεν τῇ γεωμετρίας. Πῶς λαβόντες; ἔφη. Μετά ἐπίπεδον, ἣν δ' ἐγώ, ἐν περιφορᾷ ὃν ἤδη στερεὸν λαβόντες, πρὶν αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ λαβεῖν ὀρθῶς δὲ ἔχει ἐξῆς μετὰ δευτέραν αὐξήν τρίτην λαμβάνειν. ἔστι δὲ πού τοῦτο περὶ τῶν κύβων αὐξήν καὶ τὸ βάθους μέτεχον. There is some difficulty in the words *δυνάμεναι τε καὶ δυναστεύμεναι*. It is sufficiently clear that the latter participle is intended to stand for the passive of the former, which, being of a deponent form, is obliged to borrow its passive from another verb. The meaning of the word *δύνασθαι* in its mathematical use is well known. In this use the verb *δύναται* may be rendered "when squared is equivalent to," or "makes when squared:" thus δύο δύναται τέτταρα, γραμμὴ δύναται ἐπίπεδον; as will appear more clearly from the following passages. Plato, *Theætet.* p. 147 E: τὸν ἀριθμὸν πάντα δίχα διελάβομεν. τὸν μὲν δυνάμενον ἴσον ἰσάκις γίγνεσθαι τῷ τετραγώνῳ τὸ σχῆμα ἀπεικάζαντες τετράγωνόν τε καὶ ἰσόπλευρον προσείπομεν.—τὸν τοίνυν μεταξὺ τοῦτου, ὢν καὶ τὰ τρία καὶ τὰ πέντε καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀδύνατος ἰσάκις ἴσος γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' ἢ πλείων ἐλαττονάκις ἢ ἐλάττων πλεονάκις γίγνεται, μείζων δὲ καὶ ἐλάττων αἰὲν πλευρὰ αὐτὸν περιλαμβάνει, τῷ προμήκει αὐτοῦ σχήματι ἀπεικάζαντες προμήκη ἀριθμὸν ἐκαλέσαμεν. ὅσαι μὲν γραμμαὶ τὸν ἰσόπλευρον καὶ ἐπίπεδον ἀριθμὸν τετραγωνίζουσι, μήκος ὠρισάμεθα· ὅσαι δὲ τὸν ἑτερομήκη, δυνάμεις· ὥς μήκει μὲν οὐ ζυμétrους ἐκείναις, τοῖς δὲ ἐπιπέδοις, αἱ δύνανται· καὶ περὶ τὰ στερεὰ ἄλλο τοίοντον. Euclid, lib. x. def. 3: εὐθεῖαι δυνάμει σύμμετροί εἰσιν, ὅταν τὰ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τετράγωνα τῷ αὐτῷ χωρίῳ μετρήται. Def. 5: τούτων ὑποκειμένων δείκνυται, ὅτι τῇ προτεθείῃ εὐθείᾳ ὑπάρχουσιν εὐθεῖαι πλήθει ἀπειροὶ σύμμετροί τε καὶ ἀσύμμετροι, αἱ μὲν μήκει καὶ δυνάμει, αἱ δὲ δυνάμει μόνον. If, therefore, δύναμαι is said of a number squared, its passive will imply the further pro-

cess of cubing. Consequently, αὐξήσεις δυνάμεναι τε καὶ δυναστεύμεναι are "multiplications of the square by its square root," or "raising numbers to the third power." Just so in *De Rep.* ix. p. 587 D: κατὰ δὲ δύναμιν καὶ τρίτην αὐξήν: and thus we shall see, in the course of this investigation, that in speaking of the process of cubing a number, the square is expressly mentioned as part and parcel of it. But these multiplications are described as τρεῖς ἀποστάσεις, τέτταρας δὲ ὅρους λαβοῦσαι. That the ἀποστάσεις and ὅροι are borrowed from the theory of harmonics appears clearly enough from the two following passages of Plato: *Timæus*, p. 43 D: ὥστε τὰς τοῦ διπλασίου καὶ τριπλασίου τρεῖς ἐκατέρας ἀποστάσεις καὶ τὰς τῶν ἡμιολίων καὶ ἐπιτρίτων καὶ ἐπογδῶν μεσότητας καὶ ξυνδέσεις—πάσας μὲν στρέψαι στροφὰς, κ. τ. λ. and *De Republ.* iv. p. 443 D: τὰ οἰκεῖα εὖ θέμενον, καὶ ἀρξάντα αὐτὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ κοσμήσαντα, καὶ φίλον γενόμενον ἑαυτῷ, καὶ ξυναρμόσαντα τρία ὄντα, ὥσπερ ὅρους, τρεῖς ἀρμονίας ἀτεχνῶς, νεάτης τε καὶ ὑπάτης καὶ μέσης, καὶ εἰ ἄλλα ἅττα μεταξὺ τυγχάνει ὄντα πάντα ταῦτα ξυνδήσαντα, καὶ παντάπασιν ἓνα γενόμενον ἐκ πολλῶν, σῶφρον καὶ ἡρμΟΣμένον.

In the next words there is only an apparent difficulty: he says ὁμοιούντων τε καὶ ἀνομοιούντων καὶ αὐξόντων καὶ φθινόντων, where we have three active verbs joined to one neuter, though elsewhere in Plato we have passive forms combined with the same neuter verb, as in *Parmenid.* p. 156 B: καὶ μὴν ἀνόμοιον γε καὶ ὁμοιον ὅταν γίγνηται, ὁμοιοῦσθαι τε καὶ ἀνομοιοῦσθαι;—ναί.—καὶ ὅταν μεῖζον καὶ ἔλαττον καὶ ἴσον, αὐξάνεσθαι τε καὶ φθίνειν καὶ ἰσοῦσθαι; but this need not create any difficulty; for the neuter verb φθίνειν is sufficient to determine the intransitive sense in which the others are used; a sense which is not at all uncommon in verbs of this kind: compare the use of ἐξισόω in Soph. *Electra*, 1194: μητρὶ δ' οὐδὲν ἐξισοῖ, and Thucyd. vi. 87: ἐξισώσαντες τοῖς ἄλλοις. The arithmetical use of these words is also pretty clear, although the more common terms for the αὐξόντες καὶ φθίνοντες are ὑπερτελεῖς καὶ ἐλλειπεῖς. *Similar* numbers are those whose factors, or the sides of the planes or cubes which they represent, are in the same ratio: i. e. as length to length, so breadth to breadth; *dissimilar* the contrary: thus 8 and 27, or 2^3 and 3^3 , are *similar* numbers; but 12 and 18, or 2×6 , 3×6 , *dissimilar*. *Increasing* numbers (ὑπερτελεῖς) are those which are *less* than the sum of their parts; *decreasing* (ἐλλειπεῖς) the contrary: thus 12 and 18 are *increasing* numbers, for they are less than 16 and 21, the sums of their parts; and 8 and 27 are *decreasing* numbers, for they are greater than 7 and 13, the sums of their parts*. The words προσήγορα καὶ ῥητὰ πρὸς ἄλληλα mean that the numbers spoken of are expressible in the *same* terms (προσήγορα) of one another, (as when we take the numbers 8, 12, 18, 27, each of which is $1\frac{1}{2}$ of the preceding); and all expressible in terms of one another (ῥητὰ), as in the case of the same four numbers. The next words, ὧν ἐπίτριτος πυθμὴν πεμπάδι συζυγεῖς δύο ἀρμονίας παρέχεται τρεῖς αὐξηθεῖς, are perfectly intelligible to every one conversant with the terms of Greek music. Every

* See Nicomach. p. 87. Ast.

one knows, that if we take a monochord and place a bridge under the middle of the string, half the string will strike the *octave* or *διά πασῶν*: if we move it according to the scale, three-fourths of the chord will give the *fourth* or *διά τεσσαρῶν*; and two-thirds, the *fifth* or *διά πέντε*. Accordingly, the octave is represented by 2, the fourth by $\frac{4}{3}$, and the fifth by $\frac{3}{2}$. The adjective *ἐπίτριτος* (meaning $1\frac{1}{3}$) is especially appropriated for the expression of this relation of $\frac{4}{3}$, which marks the *fourth*; as will be seen from the following passage of Plutarch (*De Musica*, p. 1138 E. p. 656. Wyttenb.): ἡ μὲν γὰρ *διά πασῶν* ἐν διπλασίονι λόγῳ θεωρεῖται. ποιήσει δ' εἰκόνοσ χάριν τὸν διπλάσιον λόγον κατ' ἀριθμὸν τὰ ἕξ καὶ τὰ δώδεκα· ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο τὸ διάστημα ἀπὸ ὑπάτης μέσων ἐπὶ νήτην διεzeugμένων. ὄντων οὖν τῶν ἕξ καὶ δώδεκα ἄκρων, ἔχει ἡ μὲν ὑπάτη μέσων τὸν τῶν ἕξ ἀριθμὸν, ἡ δὲ νήτη διεzeugμένων τὸν τῶν δώδεκα. λαβεῖν δὲ λοιπὸν χρὴ πρὸς τούτοις ἀριθμοὺς τοὺς μεταξὺ πίπτοντας, ὧν οἱ ἄκροι ὁ μὲν ἐπίτριτος, ὁ δὲ ἡμίολιος φανήσεται· εἰσὶ δὲ ὁ τῶν ὀκτώ καὶ τῶν ἐννέα· τῶν γὰρ ἕξ τὰ μὲν ὀκτώ ἐπίτριτα, τὰ δὲ ἐννέα ἡμιόλια. τὸ μὲν ἐν ἄκρον τοιοῦτο—τὸ δὲ ἄλλο τὸ τῶν δώδεκα, τῶν μὲν ἐννέα ἐπίτριτα, τῶν δ' ὀκτώ ἡμιόλια· τούτων οὖν τῶν ἀριθμῶν ὄντων μεταξὺ τῶν ἕξ καὶ τῶν δώδεκα καὶ τοῦ *διά πασῶν* διαστήματος ἐκ τοῦ *διά τεττάρων* καὶ τοῦ *διά πέντε* συνεστῶτος, δῆλον ὅτι ἔξει ἡ μὲν μέση τὸν τῶν ὀκτώ ἀριθμὸν, ἡ δὲ παραμέση τὸν τῶν ἐννέα. The word *πυθμὴν*, as it has been already shown, means the basis or fundamental number. The participle *συζυγεῖς*, which, as will be shown hereafter, implies multiplication in this particular place, denotes either multiplication or addition. The word *ἀρμονία*, which is always used by Plato and other writers to signify the *symphony* as distinguished from the *time* (*ῥυθμός*), is also explained by Plutarch: *De Anim. Procr.* 1017 F. in reference to its meaning here: τὰ δὲ πέντε καὶ τρίακοντα (οἱ Πυθαγορικοὶ ἐκάλουν) ἀρμονίαν, ὅτι συνέστηκεν ἐκ δυοῖν κύβοιν πρώτων ἀπ' ἀρτίου καὶ περιττοῦ γεγονότων, ἐκ τεσσάρων δὲ ἀριθμῶν τοῦ 5' καὶ τοῦ ἡ' καὶ τοῦ θ' καὶ ιβ' τὴν ἀριθμητικὴν καὶ τὴν ἀρμονικὴν ἀναλογίαν περιεχόντων. See also p. 1018 B. There can be no doubt that *τρίς αὐξηθεῖς* means "when it is cubed." *Ἀρμονίαν ἴσην ἰσάκισ*, ἐκατὸν τοσαυτάκισ is of course "a square number multiplied by 100." *Ἰσομήκη μὲν τῇ*, *προμήκη δὲ* refers to the cube of the same number, of which *ἴσην ἰσάκισ* represents the square; for every number not a square would be called *προμήκης*, according to the passage of the *Theætetus* quoted above*. The next words *ἐκατὸν μὲν ἀριθμῶν ἀπὸ διαμέτρων ῥητῶν πεμπάδος δεομένων ἐνὸς ἐκάστων*, *ἀρρήτων δὲ δυεῖν*, *ἐκατὸν δὲ κύβων τριάδος*, though at first sight somewhat obscure, are easily explained. The following passage of the *Politicus*, p. 266. A, B., shows clearly enough what Plato means when he speaks of the *diagonal* numerically: *τῇ διαμέτρῳ δῆπου καὶ πάλιν τῇ τῆς διαμέτρου διαμέτρῳ*.—*ἡ φύσις ἦν τὸ γένος ἡμῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων κέκτηται, μὴν ἄλλως πως εἰς τὴν πορείαν πέφυκεν ἢ καθάπερ ἡ διάμετρος ἢ δυνάμει δίπους*;—*καὶ μὴν ἢ γε τοῦ λοιποῦ γένους πάλιν ἐστὶ κατὰ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἡμετέρας*

* He says, *ἰσομήκη μὲν τῇ*, because the cube number, as described by him, is considered to involve the same factor 100, which is a square number.

δυνάμειος διάμετρος, εἴπερ δυεῖν γέ ἐστι ποδοῖν δις πεφυκυῖα. This is a joke on the division of animals into bipeds and quadrupeds. If the side of a square is represented by unity, its diagonal “δύναται” or “is δυνάμει,” the number 2, and this is the διάμετρος ἡ δυνάμει δίπους. Again, if 2 become the (side)², then the (diameter)² is 4. Accordingly, “the hundred numbers from the commensurable diameters of 5, each diminished by one, and two incommensurables, together with a hundred cubes of the number 3,” can be nothing else than the number 100 multiplied into the three following terms :

(a) (The diameter)² of the square whose side is 5, rendered rational, and diminished by unity, *i. e.* 48. For $5^2 + 5^2 = 50$, and the nearest rational number to this is 49.

(b) Two incommensurables, *i. e.* of course the first two irrationals, 2 and 3.

(c) The cube of 3 or 27.

II. Having now explained the Greek of the passage, the next step is to determine what the number in question really was. And first, for the θεῖον γεννητόν: it is stated that this was a perfect number; the first perfect number is 6; and we have express authority for believing that this was the perfect number in question. And first Plutarch (*De Anim. Procr.* 1017 C.) says: ἐν δὲ τῇ Πολιτείᾳ περὶ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ, ὃν γάμον ἔνιοι καλοῦσιν, and then comes an extract from this passage. Again the same Plutarch says immediately afterwards (p. 1018 C.) that the number 6 is a perfect number; καὶ γάμος καλεῖται διὰ τὴν τοῦ πρώτου ἀρτίου καὶ περιττοῦ σύμμιξιν.

All the properties predicated of the ἀνθρώπειον γεννητόν are implied in the number $216 = 6^3$, and there is express testimony for the importance of this number in the Pythagorean philosophy, and for its relation to the numerical system of Plato. Anatolius (in the *Theologumena Arithmetica*, p. 40. ed. Ast.) tells us that this number 216 is the period of the Pythagorean metempsychosis: Ἀνδροκύδης δὲ ὁ Πυθαγορικὸς ὁ περὶ τῶν συμβόλων γράψας, καὶ Εὐβουλίδης ὁ Πυθαγορικὸς καὶ Ἀριστόξενος καὶ Ἰππάβोटος καὶ Νεάνθης οἱ κατὰ τὸν ἄνδρα ἀναγράψαντες σιστ’ ἔτεσι τὰς μετεμψυχώσεις τὰς αὐτῷ συμβεβηκυῖας ἔφασαν γεγονέναι μετὰ τοσαῦτα γοῦν ἔτη εἰς παλιγγενεσίαν ἐλθεῖν Πυθαγόραν καὶ ἀναζητῆσαι, ὥσανεὶ μετὰ τὴν πρώτην ἀνακύκλωσιν καὶ ἐπάνοδον τοῦ ἀπὸ ἐξ ψυχογονικοῦ κυβοῦ. To the same effect also Nicomachus Gerasenus (*Institutio Arithmetica*, lib. ii. p. 143, ed. Ast.) explains the ἀποστάσεις and ὅροι in the passage of Plato as referring to the two mean proportionals between two cubes, such as 8 and 27, which are included in 216 for $6^3 = 2^3 \times 3^3$. So also Euclid, lib. viii. prop. 12: δυὸ κύβων ἀριθμῶν δύο μέσοι ἀνάλογόν εἰσιν ἀριθμοί, καὶ ὁ κύβος πρὸς τὸν κύβον τριπλασίονα λόγον ἔχει ἢ περ ἢ πλευρὰ πρὸς τὴν πλευράν. It is natural that Plato should select the two least cube numbers for this purpose, and these two are 8 and 27; the mean proportionals between which are 12 and 18: the proportion therefore is

$$8 : 12 :: 18 : 27$$

These are the four $\delta\rho\alpha\iota$: the three intervals or $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ are 4, 6, 9. Now each of the $\delta\rho\alpha\iota$ is to the preceding in the *sesquialtera ratio*, and consequently the same is the case with the $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$; for

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 8 : 12 & :: & 12 : 18 & :: & 18 : 27 & :: & 2 : 3 \\ \text{and } 4 : 6 & :: & 6 : 9 & :: & & :: & 2 : 3 \end{array}$$

Therefore they are all $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\alpha$ καὶ $\rho\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}$ πρὸς ἄλληλα. They are also *similar* and *dissimilar*, *increasing* and *decreasing* numbers, as we have shown above.

Let us now see if this number 216, which applies to the first part of the description, will also answer to the second. "Of which," says Plato, "the fundamental $\frac{4}{3}$ combined with the 5 furnishes, when it is cubed, two harmonies," &c. Both Aristotle and Plutarch have referred to these words in particular. Aristotle says (*Polit.* v. c. 12, § 7.): ἐν δὲ τῇ Πολιτείᾳ λέγεται μὲν περὶ τῶν μεταβολῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωκράτους, οὐ μέντοι λέγεται καλῶς· τῆς τε γὰρ ἀρίστης πολιτείας καὶ πρώτης οὔσης οὐ λέγει τὴν μεταβολὴν ἰδίως. Φησὶ γὰρ αἴτιον εἶναι τὸ μὴ μένειν μήθεν ἀλλ' ἐν τινι περιόδῳ μεταβάλλειν, ἀρχὴν δ' εἶναι τούτων ὧν ἐπίτριτος πυθμὴν πεμπάδι συζυγεῖς δύο ἁρμονίας παρέχεται, λέγων ὅταν ὁ τοῦ διαγράμματος ἀριθμὸς τούτου γένηται στερεὸς, ὡς τῆς φύσεώς ποτε φυνούσης φαύλους καὶ κρείττους τῆς παιδείας. Plutarch's words are (*De Iside et Osiride*, p. 373 E.): Αἰγυπτίους δ' ἂν τις εἰκάσειε τῶν τριγώνων ὁ κάλλιστον, τούτῳ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς φύσιν ὁμοιούντας· ᾧ καὶ Πλάτων ἐν τῇ Πολιτείᾳ δοκεῖ προσκεχρῆσθαι, τὸ γαμήλιον διάγραμμα συντάττων. ἔχει δ' ἐκεῖνο τὸ τρίγωνον τριῶν τὴν πρὸς ὀρθὰς καὶ τεττάρων τὴν βάσιν καὶ πέντε τὴν ὑποτείνουσαν, ἴσον ταῖς περιεχούσαις δυναμένην. Εἰκαστέον οὖν τὴν μὲν πρὸς ὀρθὰς ἄρῃενι, τὴν δὲ βάσιν θηλείᾳ, τὴν δὲ ὑποτείνουσαν ἀμφοῖν ἐκγόνῳ. From a comparison of these two passages it is sufficiently clear that Plato is understood by both philosophers as speaking of the right-angled triangle, of which the sides are 3, 4, 5, and $5^3 + 4^3 + 3^3 = 6^3$. The same is also stated by Proclus, and Aristides Quintilianus. Proclus (*Comment. super Primo Euclidis*, lib. iv. p. 111) says: Δίττων δὲ ὄντων τῶν ὀρθογωνίων τριγώνων, τῶν μὲν ἰσοσκελῶν, τῶν δὲ σκαληνῶν, ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἰσοσκέλεσιν οὐκ ἂν ποτε εὔροιμεν ἀριθμοὺς ἐφαρμόσαι ταῖς πλευραῖς. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ τετράγωνος ἀριθμὸς τετραγώνου διπλάσιος, εἰ μὴ λέγοι τις τὸν σύνεγγυς. ὁ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ζ' τοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ε' διπλάσιόν ἐστιν α' δέοντος. ἐν δὲ σκαληνοῖς δυνατὸν λαβεῖν ἐναργῶς ἡμῖν δείκνυνται τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑποτείνουσης τὴν ὀρθὴν ἴσον τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ τὴν ὀρθήν. Τοίοντον γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐν Πολιτείᾳ τρίγωνον, οὗ τὴν ὀρθὴν περιέχουσιν ὁ τε τρία καὶ ὁ τέσσαρα, ὑποτείνει δὲ αὐτὴν ὁ ε'· τὸ γοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ ε' τετράγωνον ἴσον ἐστὶ τοῖς ἀπ' ἐκείνων. τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν εἰκοσιπέντε, τὰ ἀπ' ἐκείνων δὲ, τὸ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ γ', θ', τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν δ' ἐκκαίδεκα. Aristid. Quintil. (*De Musica*, iii. p. 152): ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων λόγων ἐστὶ τὸ σχῆμα δεκτικόν· ἢ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τριῶν εὐθεῖα διαιροῖτ' ἂν εἰς τὸν διπλασίῳ λόγον· [ἢ δὲ ἐκ τεσσάρων εἰς τὸν ἴσον· ἢ δὲ ἐκ πέντε εἰς τὸν ἡμιόλιον·] αἱ δὲ τὴν ὀρθὴν περιεχούσαι δηλοῦσι τὸν ἐπίτριτον. τούτου δὴ καὶ Πλάτων φησὶν ἐπίτριτον πυθμένα πεντάδι συζυγέοντα. The two ratios with which the Greeks were best acquainted from their musical scale, were $\frac{4}{3}$ and $\frac{3}{2}$, representing the 4th and 5th,

which, when multiplied together, gave the number 2, or the representative of their *diapason*. There can be no doubt then that Plato desired to show how these ratios were implied in the number which he has selected for the *περίοδος* of his state. Now this number 216 is the product of the cubes of 2 and 3, which are the two last terms in the Platonic tetractys. The Pythagoreans (according to Plutarch, p. 1017 E. quoted above) gave the name of *ἁρμονία* to the *sum* of these two cubes, *i. e.* to the number 35. The period of the metempsychosis was the *product* of the same two cubes, or the number 216. And Plato here speaks of two *ἁρμονίαι* resulting from the quotients of the same two cubes and the corresponding squares. He thinks fit to express this in terms of the right-angled triangle referred to by Aristotle and Plutarch, expressly stating that the number 100 is a coefficient of each expression. Thus, the first *ἁρμονία* is *ἴσην ἰσάκεις, ἑκατὸν τοσαντάκεις*: in other words

$$\left(\frac{4}{3} \times 5\right)^2 = 100 \times \frac{2^2}{3^2}$$

And the second *ἁρμονία*, a cube of the same root, is described as one hundred multiplied by (1), the rational diameter of 5, diminished by unity, *i. e.* as shown above, 48; (2) two incommensurable diameters, *i. e.* the first two irrationals, or 2 and 3; and (3) the cube of 3, or 27: thus we have

$$(48 + 5 + 27) 100 = 1000 \times 2^3.$$

Of course this second harmony is to be the cube of the number, of which the former harmony is the square, and therefore must be divided by the cube of 3. In other words, the whole expression will be $\frac{8000}{27}$, as the former was $\frac{400}{9}$. Consequently the two expressions stand in this symmetrical ratio to one another:—

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} \quad \frac{4^2}{3^2} \cdot 5^2 &= \frac{2^2}{3^2} \cdot 10^2 \\ \text{(b)} \quad \frac{4^3}{3^3} \cdot 5^3 &= \frac{2^3}{3^3} \cdot 10^3 \end{aligned}$$

If it be asked why Plato has thought it necessary to describe the numbers of which the numerator of the second harmony is the sum, it may be remarked that

$$\frac{48}{27} = \frac{16 \times 3}{9 \times 3} = \frac{4^2}{3^2}, \text{ i. e. } \frac{48}{27} \text{ is the duplicate ratio of } \frac{4}{3}.$$

But $4^2 + 3^2 = 5^2$; so that we have here another combination of the three sides of the *γαμήλιον διάγραμμα*.

On the whole then there is no difficulty in ascertaining what is the number referred to in this celebrated passage, and in pointing out the arithmetical combination here implied. Expressed generally, this is what Plato says: The period of the world is defined by the perfect number 6; that of the state by the cube of that number, or 216, which is the product of the last pair of terms in the *Platonic* tetractys; and if we take this as the basis of our computation, we shall have two cube numbers (*αὐξήσεις δυνάμεναι τε καὶ δυναστευό-*

μεναι), namely, 8 and 27, and the mean proportionals between these, namely 12 and 18, will furnish three intervals and four terms, and these terms and the intervals stand related to one another in the *sesquialtera ratio*, i. e. each term to the preceding as $\frac{3}{2}$. Now if we remember that the number $216 = 8 \times 27 = 3^3 + 4^3 + 5^3$, and that $3^2 + 4^2 = 5^2$, we must admit that this number implies the numbers 3, 4, and 5, to which musicians attach so much importance. And if we combine the ratio $\frac{4}{3}$, with the number 5, or multiply the ratio of the sides by the hypotenuse, we shall, by first squaring and then cubing, obtain two expressions which denote the ratio of the two last pairs of terms in the Platonic tetractys, the former multiplied by the square, the latter by the cube, of the number 10, the sum of the first four digits, which constitute the *Pythagorean* tetractys.

III. As it appears then, that it is possible to ascertain the meaning of Plato's words, and to point out the arithmetical details to which he refers, it only remains that we should be able to show why he has thought it necessary to introduce this calculation into his dialogue on the state.

The importance which Plato attached to numbers in general, especially as far as they are connected with the theory of harmonics, is sufficiently obvious to the most careless student of his philosophy, and if any one wished to convince himself on the subject, it would only be necessary to refer him to the first chapter of Theo-Smyr-næus (Περὶ Ἀριθμητικῆς, c. i. p. 2 *seqq.*, ed. Gelder.). But Plato did not merely believe in the immutable truth of harmonic proportions; he thought, with many of his countrymen, that there was something fatal in numbers—that good luck and bad luck actually depended upon them,—and in general that they were types of the fixed and invariable. The main part of his Republic rests on this assumption. He assumes that the whole province of virtue is exhausted by the four (so called) cardinal virtues, justice, prudence, fortitude, and temperance; that there are three, and only three, parts of the human soul, the reason, the will, and the appetite; and three classes of citizens, regulated by these; namely, the philosophical rulers corresponding to the reason; the valiant soldiers representing the will; and the turbulent populace answering to the appetite: and as the virtues of prudence, fortitude, and temperance represent the active virtues of the three classes in the state, as well as of the three divisions of the soul, justice, according to Plato, is that harmony which keeps them all in due subordination, so that the higher faculties exercise a proper control over the lower, and the whole is moulded into one concord. It thus appears that there can be but one perfect state. But there were four several varieties of government among the Greeks, the timocracy, the oligarchy, the democracy, and the tyranny; and as there was one just man exemplifying the perfect state, so there are four men differing more or less from that exemplar, and corresponding respectively to the four imperfect polities. Now, in the passage before us, Plato is speaking of the causes which might induce a deterioration of his commonwealth, and he connects these causes with the transition of the best form of

government to the successive stages of corrupt and imperfect constitutions. The primary cause of this transition is the intermixture of classes in the state, or the interference on the part of one with the proper business of the others; and in the individual the falling off from justice is similarly described as a predominance of some one of the lower faculties, and its intrusion into the province of government properly assigned to the supreme faculty of the reason. Thus, *ambition* produces *timocracy*, *avarice* begets *oligarchy*, *intemperance* gives birth to *democracy*, and *tyranny* springs from an overflow of *lust and passion*.

From this it is evident that the numbers 3, 4, and 5 are essential to the details of Plato's system. There are three faculties of the mind, three classes in the state, four virtues, and five forms of government. The harmony which keeps the state together is $\frac{4}{3}$, or the relation between the four cardinal virtues and the three faculties of the soul; and this ratio, compounded with the number 5, which represents the five forms of government, might be supposed, from fanciful analogies it must be owned, to represent in part the conditions of change from the perfect state. The number 10, and its square and cube, which appear as coefficients of these expressions, are important in the Pythagorean numerical system. The number 10 is the sum of the first four digits, which constitute the Pythagorean tetractys. The number $100 = 10^2$ is, according to Plato, the proper terminus of human life. And the number $1000 = 10^3$ is the proper terminus of the life of the state; since, according to Jean Paul, the race of men lives as many thousand years as the individual lives years, or, to express it in the language of the text, the numbers upon which we reason in our political essays must be cubes, as these numbers alone contain a durable basis of harmony. The cube itself implies all the harmonic numbers; for it consists of twelve sides, eight angles, and six planes, and these numbers stand related to one another in harmonic proportion. Besides, the number 6 itself, as the combination of the first odd and even, was of importance in the musical theories of the ancients. It seems to have been considered the first of harmonies, and was therefore called *'Αφροδίτη*, from the goddess of love, who was the mother of Harmonia: whence the size in the game of hazard was called the Venus throw. The reason then why Plato introduced this calculation seems to be simply this: he found that the *diatessaron* multiplied by 5, and the product cubed, is equal to the triplicate ratio of 10 to the *diapente*. Now the product of the *diatessaron* and the *diapente* constitutes the *diapason* for $\frac{4}{3} \times \frac{3}{2} = 2$; and this diapason represents the harmonic power of political justice*. Consequently, as the cube in question contains only one or the other of the two constituent parts of the

* Plato, *De Rep.* iv. 431 ε, p. 443 E. Comp. Cicero *De Republ.* II. 42, § 69. Shaksp. *Henry V.*, Act I. Scene I.—

“For government, though high, and low, and lower,
Put into parts doth keep in one concent,
Congreeing in a full and natural close,
Like music.”

diapason, it does not contain the principle of permanence, or, in other words, it represents, in terms of the cause, the period fatal to the permanence of distinct classes in the state.

It must be admitted that all this is an idle though ingenious play with numbers: but there are many instances, as well in other writers as in Plato, of the existence of this tendency. Thus, not to go any further, we find Plato, in this same dialogue (*De Rep.* ix. p. 587 C.), distinctly asserting that the tyrant is 729 times more unhappy than the sovereign of his perfect state; for the order of the governments is as follows: the (1) aristocracy, or perfect government; (2) the timocracy; (3) oligarchy; (4) democracy; and (5) tyranny; the oligarch then is third from the aristocrat, therefore he is thrice as wretched as the aristocrat; the tyrant is third from the oligarch, therefore he is thrice as wretched as the oligarch; the tyrant therefore, is nine times as wretched as the aristocrat; and if we cube this number, according to Plato's plan, in order to complete the calculation, we shall find that the number 729 is the representative of his aggravated misery. Again, in the *Laws* (v. p. 737), we find Plato limiting his citizens by the number 5040: ἀριθμοῦ τινος ἕνεκα προσήκοντος. Now this number is only the continued product of the first seven digits; and the number 7, as the sum of 4 and 3, the sides of the γαμήλιον διάγραμμα, is of frequent occurrence in these fanciful calculations: for the Platonic tetractys consist of seven terms: 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 8, 27, and the sum of the first six terms is represented by the seventh, the number 27, which is also equal to the sum of the first six digits after unity.

In general, not only among the Greeks but even more so among other nations, great importance was attached to numbers. The reverence paid to the number *seven* by the Jews (compare Herod. iii. 8. with the Hebrew root שבע "to seven," i. e. "to swear;" and see *Gen.* xxi. 28; *Numbers* xxiii. 1. 29, &c.), and the political numbers of the Etruscans, Latins, and others, are exemplifications of the same feeling. And if Plato, with all his genius, was not exempt from a similar bias, though we may regret that it was so, yet we cannot be surprised that, living when he lived, and educated as he was, he could not refrain, like the king Bhângâsuris in the Sanscrit poem (*Nalus*, book xx.), from interrupting his long and earnest journey in order to display to the world his much-prized skill in arithmetic.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

MAY 12, 1843.

No. 9.

The Right Rev. The LORD BISHOP OF St. DAVID's, President,
in the Chair.

Tertulliani Liber Apologeticus, with a Preface intended as an introduction to the study of Patristical and Ecclesiastical Latinity, by H. A. Woodham, Esq., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, was laid on the table,—presented by the author.

Duncan Farquharson Gregory, Esq., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, was elected a member of the Society.

The following communications were then read :—

1. “On the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands.” By the Rev. Richard Garnett.

The author believed that many members of the Society felt a particular interest in the investigation of the languages and dialects now or formerly current in the British islands; and he proposed from time to time to submit a few remarks on such points connected with them as appeared most worthy of notice.

The Celtic dialects have obviously the first claim on our attention on the ground of priority : and it is, moreover, a matter of curiosity to inquire what influence they have exercised upon our present forms of speech. It is also of some importance to the general philologist to ascertain what place they occupy in the European and Asiatic families of languages. Till lately they were supposed by various eminent scholars to form a class apart, and to have no connexion whatever with the great Indo-European stock. This was strongly asserted by Col. Vans Kennedy, and also maintained, though in rather more guarded terms, by Bopp, Pott, and Schlegel. The researches of Dr. Prichard in ‘The Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations,’ and of Professor Pictet of Geneva, in his truly able work, ‘*Sur l’Affinité des langues Celtiques avec le Sanscrit*,’ may be considered as having settled the question the other way; and as proving satisfactorily that the assertions of the philologists above-mentioned were those of persons who had never properly investigated the matter, and were consequently incompetent to decide upon it. The demonstration of Pictet is so complete, that the German scholars who had previously denied the connexion, now fully admit it; and several of them have written elaborate treatises, showing more affinities between Celtic and Sanscrit than perhaps really exist. This may serve to show the danger of dogmatizing in philology upon insufficient data.

It is but justice to the memory of a meritorious Celtic scholar,

Edward Lhuyd, to observe that he clearly pointed out the affinity between the Celtic dialects and such Indo-European languages as were then known, nearly a century and a half ago. Sanscrit had at that period scarcely been heard of in Great Britain; but the many coincidences which Lhuyd incidentally shows between Welsh, Gaelic, &c. and the Greek, Latin and Teutonic tongues, prove that he was well aware of the affinity between them. One instance which he gives is so creditable to his sagacity, and withal so instructive, that we may be permitted to dwell a few moments upon it.

No German or English philologer had, as far as the author knew, given a satisfactory etymology of the term *summer*. Lhuyd justly observes that it is, etymologically speaking, the same word as the Welsh *hav*; and that the proof of this may be found in the Irish forms *samh* and *samradh*, the Gaelic *s* answering to the Cymric *h*. Professor Pictet has observed the affinity between the Sanscrit root '*sam*' and the Irish *samh*, both involving the idea of *mild, soft, gentle*; *samhradh* being literally the mild or genial quarter. The Sanscrit term is recognised by the German philologists as the root of the ancient Teutonic *samft*=English *soft*: and the author thought it afforded a more likely etymology for the Greek adjective *ἡμερος*, *mild, tame*, and for *ἡμέρα*, *day*, than has hitherto been offered. It would seem very unlikely, *à priori*, that *day* and *night* could be derived from the same root; yet there is reason to believe that such is the case in one instance. '*Samanī*, confessedly from '*sam*', is a Sanscrit term for *night*, apparently on account of its *stillness*; as *summer*, and *ἡμέρα*, supposing them to be from the same root, convey the idea of a mild genial *temperature*. An analogy of this kind between such apparently remote languages as Welsh, German, Greek and Sanscrit, is calculated to suggest a variety of important reflections.

It is scarcely necessary to adduce the testimonies of Cæsar and Tacitus as to the similarity between the ancient British and the Celtic of Gaul. The declaration of Cæsar that the language of the Belgæ differed from that of the other Gauls, is explained by Strabo, who describes the different tribes as *μικρὸν παραλλάττοντες ταῖς γλώσσαις*,—slightly diverging in language; in other words, the difference was merely dialectical. Several elaborate attempts have been made to show that the language of the Gauls and other continental Celts, and consequently that of a majority of the Britons, was in fact Gaelic; the Armoric and Cymric dialects being peculiar to the Picts. Though our materials for deciding this question are not very copious, it is believed that, if fairly examined and used, they will be found sufficient. Besides many proper names, Greek and Latin authors have preserved several hundred Gallic words, many of them appellations of plants and other common objects. A considerable proportion may be identified as still subsisting, or capable of explanation in living Celtic tongues; but as far as they go, they do not afford much countenance to the Gaelic hypothesis. Some of them are undoubtedly found in Gaelic, but very few *exclusively* so; and what may be considered as decisive of the question is, that the *forms*

of the most remarkable words cannot be reconciled to the peculiarities of the Gaelic dialects.

The following instances, to which many others might be added, may perhaps be regarded as affording some countenance to this assertion :—

Petorritum, a four-wheeled carriage ; adduced as a Gallic word by Cicero, Quintilian and others : Welsh, *peder*, four, and *rhod*, a wheel.

Pempedula, according to Dioscorides, Apuleius, and other ancient medical writers, the Gallic name of the *Quinquefolium*, or cinquefoil. In Welsh, *pumdalen* ; from *pump*, five, and *dalen*, a leaf. We may here observe the analogies of the Æolic πέμπε, five, and the Sanscrit *dala*, leaf.

Candetum, according to Columella, a Gallic measure of 100 feet. Welsh, *cant*, a hundred.

The above etymologies may be considered as certain ; and it is equally certain that words including those elements could not be Gaelic, to the genius and structure of which they are totally foreign. The Gaelic terms for *four*, *five*, *hundred*, are respectively *ceathair*, *cuig*, *cead* ; it is therefore as impossible that the words we have adduced should be Gaelic, as that τετραφύλλον, πενταφύλλον, and ἐκατόμπεδον should be pure Latin.

Again, *Epona*, a deity said to be adopted from the Gauls, was the goddess of *horses* ; Eporedia, now Ivrea in Piedmont, and its inhabitants, the *Eporedices*, were so called from their devotion to horse-racing and skill in horse-breaking. *Ep.* is not extant in Welsh as a simple term for a horse, but Pelletier gives it as ancient Armorican, and it still subsists in compounds and derivatives : *ebran*, horse-provender ; *ebol*, a colt (*equuleus*), and some others. *Rhedu* and *rhedeg* are the common Welsh terms for *to run* or *to race*. The Gaelic word for *horse* is *each* ; whence we may infer that the Eporedices did not employ that dialect, but one analogous to that of the Cymru or Armoricans.

Further, *Halle* and *Hallein* are names of various places in Southern and Middle Germany possessing *salt-works* ; and in some localities *Hall* is used as a simple appellative, denoting any place where salt is manufactured. It is well known that Southern Germany was long occupied by Celtic tribes, many of them emigrants from Gaul, and this at once points out the Cymric and Armorican *hal*, *halen*, salt, as the etymology of such places. The Gaelic *sal-ann*, and the German *salz*, are equally out of the question.

A great mass of collateral evidence might be adduced from continental proper names, ancient and modern ; such as *Nantuates*, *Nantouin*, *Nanteuil*, and many others,—obviously from *nant*, a valley, a word unknown in Gaelic : from words still current in France, *ex. gr.* *goelan*, a gull, Breton *gwelen*, Welsh *gwyllan*, Gaelic *faelan* ; *goemon*, sea-weed, Welsh *gwymon*, Gaelic *feaman* ; and from the fact that most of the words preserved by ancient authors agree more nearly with the Welsh or Armorican equivalents than with the correspond-

ing terms in the Irish or Highland dialects. *Velarus*, water-cress, would appear at first sight to come nearer the Gaelic *biolar* than the Welsh *berwr*. But the truth is, that *biorar* (from *bior*, water) is the ancient and genuine Gaelic form; *velarus* and *biolar* being mere euphonic modifications to avoid the unpleasant concourse of two *r*'s. At all events, the Armorican form *beler* comes as near as the Gaelic.

It is right to observe, that there is one ancient Gaelic term which, as far as our present information goes, can only be explained from the Gaelic, namely, *carbidoslupon*, the *Plantago major*, or broad-leaved plantain. The plant in question had the credit of possessing vulnerary properties; and, supposing *carbidoslupon* to mean *wound-wort*, it readily resolves itself into the Gaelic *cearbadh*, wound or cut, and *lubh* or *luibh* herb,—a term not found in Welsh. *Beliocanda*, *Achillæa millefolium*, or yarrow, might bear either the interpretation of *hundred-flowers* or *hundred-leaves*. In the former case, the first portion of the word would appear to be the Gaelic *billeog*, leaf; in the latter, the Welsh *bloen*, flower, would come as near as any Gaelic word; but in every case the latter half, *canda*, hundred, would be non-Gaelic. *Scobiis*, the elder-tree, is plainly the Breton *skao* and Welsh *ysgaw*. The Gaelic word is *droman*. One of the most remarkable among the few relics of ancient Gaulish that we possess, occurs on a tablet found at Paris A.D. 1711, representing a bull, with three birds, and bearing the inscription TARWOS TRIGARANOS. The monument is supposed to have reference to the mythology of the ancient Gauls: the words of the inscription are (bating the terminations *os*) Welsh to a letter; *tarw*, bull, *tri*, three, and *gāran*, crane. In Gaelic, *tarbh*, bull, and *tri*, three, agree pretty well; but *corr*, or *corr-mhonadh*, is a totally different word from *gāran*. We may here observe the obvious analogy between *gāran* and the Greek γέπavos, and may also remark that the Celtic word is *significant*, being derived from *gār*, a shank, and consequently is not a borrowed word, though the Greek term possibly may be.

If we have succeeded in establishing the point that the language of the ancient Gauls bore a general analogy to the dialects of Wales and Armorica, it will follow, as a corollary, that the same analogy extended to the language of South Britain. It has already been observed that attempts have been made to deny this, and to show that the ancient South Britons were Gael, and that the Welsh language was, before and during the Roman period, confined to the provinces north of the Forth and Clyde. Much stress has been laid on the testimony of E. Lhuyd, who thought he could detect in the names of rivers and other local appellations in South Britain, traces of an older Gaelic population. It may here be observed, that by those ancient Gael (or Gwyddel as he calls them) Lhuyd neither means the *Scoti* nor the Britons of the Roman period, but a primitive race whom he supposes to have preceded the Cymru in Britain and the Milesians in Ireland, and whose existence in the former country, though possible enough, is purely hypothetical. It is more to the point to observe that Lhuyd's premises do not bear out his conclu-

sions, scarcely one of the terms which he alleges being exclusively Gaelic. One on which he lays great stress is *Wisk*, the name of several British rivers, which he observes is the Gaelic *uisge*, water. But though *wysg* in Welsh does not now precisely mean *water*, it means a stream or current, and, metaphorically, *course*, *career*; an analogy of import sufficiently close to justify the belief of its being of the same origin as the Gaelic word. It would be easy to show that all the other words which he alleges are known to the Welsh or Armorican dialects, either as simple terms or in compounds and derivatives; consequently the hypothesis attempted to be founded on them falls of itself to the ground.

It is not meant to be asserted that the language of the Southern Britons was, strictly speaking, Welsh. The Cymric or Welsh was not the whole British language, but a particular dialect, chiefly prevalent in certain northern and western provinces. Cæsar informs us that many Belgæ were established in the southern parts of the island, and the Welsh themselves make a distinction between the Lloegrians and the Cymru. Giraldus Cambrensis, speaking of the Welsh and Cornish languages, expresses an opinion that the latter bore the most analogy to the speech of the ancient Southern Britons; and there are plausible reasons for believing that idea to be well-founded: That the ancient South British could not be Gaelic, is shown abundantly by the topographical nomenclature of the country, both ancient and modern. The non-Gaelic terms *pen*, *pant*, *nant*, *comb* (W. *cwm*), a valley, *chevin* (W. *cefn*), a ridge, and many similar ones, occur in almost every county; while, on the other hand, peculiar Gaelic terms found in almost every barony in Ireland, such as *cluain*, plain, *sliabh*, mountain, are totally unknown in England. Another argument may be deduced from Celtic terms still current, especially in provincial dialects, which it is believed are more numerous than is commonly supposed.

The pointing out of particular instances will belong to a subsequent branch of our inquiry; at present it may be observed, that though the Cornish and Breton regularly correspond with the Welsh in forms (which is the most certain proof of affinity), it is not to be denied that they not unfrequently agree with the Irish in particular words. For example, Ir. *athair*, serpent; Bret. *aer*. Ir. *alach*, with young; Bret. *ala*, to calve, yean. Ir. *baobhalta*, simple, stupid; Bret. *bavedik*. Ir. *bochd*, poor; Corn. *bochodoc*. Ir. *faobhar*, edge of a sharp instrument; Corn. *fyvar*; with many others. We are not, however, to regard such words as *borrowed* from the Gaelic (of which there is no proof), but as collaterally descended in both classes from the ancient Celtic. The Breton *asrech*, Corn. *edrak*, *edrege*, Ir. *aithrighe*, repentance, are remarkable for their resemblance to the Gothic *idreigon*, to repent, which the Teutonic philologists know not well how to analyse. Another word of unknown origin used by Ulphilas, viz. *aibr*, gift or offering, bears a strong likeness to the Welsh *aberth*, sacrifice. These instances might almost lead one to suspect that our present text of the Gothic Gospels

was revised in some locality where Celtic theological terms were current: but it would be unsafe to erect a theory upon so slender a foundation.

Some eminent scholars, particularly Adelung, and Price (the editor of Warton's 'History of Poetry'), have expressed an opinion that Welsh was, in fact, the language of the Belgic Gauls, and state as a proof of this, that it exhibits strong symptoms of admixture with Teutonic. There appears to be no solid foundation for this hypothesis. There are undoubtedly a number of Teutonic words in the Armorican dialects, and still more in the Irish, which *may* have been derived from the Belgæ of Gaul or Britain, or the Firbolg, said to have preceded the Scoti in Ireland. But the Cymru proper were, of all known Celtic tribes, the most remote from Germanic influence. It is not to be supposed that Belgic immigrants in Hampshire and Wiltshire could influence the language of Strath Clyde, Cumberland, or North Wales; and excepting a few terms adopted at a comparatively recent period from the Anglo-Saxon or English, there is nothing in the whole compass of the language that can be proved to be *borrowed* from the Teutonic. Words with Germanic prefixes and affixes are totally unknown; and where the terms are cognate, the peculiarity of form proves the Welsh ones to be genuine. For instance, *cas*, to hate, is not borrowed from the German *hassen*, nor *hal*, salt, from *salz*, any more than the Greek ἀλς is borrowed from *sal*, or ἔρπω from *serpo*, or *vice versa*. One observation appears to be nearly conclusive as to this point. It is a well-known peculiarity of the Germanic tongues, that they abound in words beginning with *s*, followed by one or more consonants; and similar combinations are also admissible in Gaelic and Armorican. But no such union would be tolerated in Welsh. An initial *s* is invariably followed by a vowel; and when the etymology would require the concurrence of a consonant, it is either elided, as in *seren*, star, Armorican *steren*; or the pronunciation is softened by prefixing a vowel, as *ysnoden*, a band or fillet, Lowland Scotch *snood*. This remarkable peculiarity is scarcely to be reconciled to the idea of a strong admixture of German blood and German language. The fact is, that Adelung set out with a preconceived idea of the radical non-affinity of the two classes of tongues; and whenever he met with a Celtic word resembling a German one, directly concluded that it must have been borrowed. For example, he takes it for granted that the Celtic *abhall* (*afall*), *apple*, was borrowed from the German *apfel*, though the word is found in all the Celtic, Teutonic and Slavonic dialects, and does not in reality belong to one more than another, having descended to all from some common source.

2. "On the Structure of the Russian Verb," by Dr. Trithen of Rugby. Communicated by Professor Wilson.

The Russian grammar of Gryech enumerates no less than seventy-two classes of verbs, each of which has its peculiar system of inflexions. Other grammarians have endeavoured to reduce the number, but

have effected their object only by creating a most inconvenient number of exceptions. The infinitive is considered as the verbal root, from which the other verbal forms are derived according to certain rules. The present tense alone has its proper personal endings, the preterite being expressed by a participle, and the future by means of the infinitive and a verb substantive.

Schmidt has attempted to arrange all the Russian verbs, as regards their conjugation, into two classes :—the first of these forms, the 1st pers. sing. of the present indicative, as follows :—

When the inf. ends in		The 1st pers. pres. t. ends in	
1.	<i>at'</i> *	<i>ayu,</i>
2.	<i>yat'</i>	<i>yayu,</i>
3.	<i>ovat'</i>	<i>uyu,</i>
4.	<i>evat'</i>	<i>yuyu,</i>
5.	<i>ot'</i>	<i>yu,</i>
6.	<i>ut'</i>	<i>uyu,</i>
7.	<i>uit'</i>	<i>oyu,</i>
8.	<i>yet'</i>	<i>yeyu,</i>
1.	<i>zt'</i>	}	<i>zu,</i>
	<i>zti</i>		
2.	<i>st'</i>		
	<i>sti</i>	}	<i>du,</i>
3.	<i>ch'</i>		
		<i>ku.</i>

Verbs of the second class consist of two or more syllables, and the scheme according to which they form their present tense is as follows :—

When the inf. ends in		The 1st pers. pres. t. ends in	
1.	<i>yet'</i>	<i>yu,</i>
2.	<i>dit'</i>	<i>zhu,</i>
3.	<i>pyet'</i>	<i>plyu,</i>
4.	<i>syet'</i>	<i>shu,</i>
5.	<i>tyet'</i>	<i>chu,</i>
6.	<i>it'</i>	<i>yu,</i>
7.	<i>bit'</i>	<i>blyu,</i>
8.	<i>vit'</i>	<i>vlyu,</i>
9.	<i>pit'</i>	<i>plyu,</i>
10.	<i>dit'</i>	<i>zhu,</i>
11.	<i>zit'</i>	<i>zhu,</i>
12.	<i>sit'</i>	<i>shu,</i>
13.	<i>tit'</i>	<i>chu,</i>
14.	<i>stit'</i>	<i>shchu.</i>

The exceptions however are numerous, and the arrangement is in other respects imperfect and unsatisfactory.

The author considered that some light might be thrown on the nature of the Russian inflexions, if the verbs were ranged in conjugations corresponding to those of the Sanskrit. In the latter lan-

* Both the letters *err'* and *er'* have been represented by an apostrophe ('), and a consonant before the *err* has been doubled. *Zh* represents the sound of *z* in *azure*, and *ch* and *sh* have their common English pronunciation.

guage the personal endings are joined to the verbal root, either immediately, or by the aid of certain auxiliary vowels. The composition of the Russian verb is similar to that of the Sanskrit; but the Russian verbs which use the auxiliary vowels are comparatively few, while in Sanskrit they greatly outnumber those which join the endings immediately to the root.

The following table exhibits the personal endings in Russian, Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin.

		Russ.	Sans.	Greek.	Lat.
Sing.	1 pers.	<i>u</i>	mi	$\begin{matrix} \mu \\ \omega \end{matrix} \}$	o
	2	<i>sh'</i>	si	<i>s</i>	s
	3	<i>tt'</i>	ti	<i>ti</i>	t
Plur.	1 pers.	<i>mm'</i>	mah	<i>mes</i>	mus,
	2	<i>te</i>	tha	<i>te</i>	tis,
	3	<i>utt'</i>	anti	<i>onti</i>	unt.

When any one of the Sanskrit endings, beginning with *m* or *v* follows an *a*, it always lengthens that vowel, as *bhavā-mi* I am, but *bhava-si* thou art, *bhava-ti* he is; and Bopp compares this long *a* with the Greek ending ω and the Latin *o*. The author considered that an *m* was latent in the Russian ending *u*, as also in the accusative of Russian nouns in *a*: *rozu*, *rosam* Lat., *muza*, *musam* Lat.

Before we examine the conjugational forms, under which the personal endings are added to the root of the Russian verb, it may be expedient to discuss certain laws of letter-change which prevail in the two languages, Russian and Sanskrit.

In Sanskrit the short vowels *a i u* have been considered by grammarians as units, and the long vowels $\bar{a} \bar{i} \bar{u}$ as double their value, that is, as equal to 2 *a*, 2 *i*, 2 *u*. The Sanskrit diphthong *e** is a combination of *a* and *i*; and when *e* is followed by *a*, it is resolved into its elements, and *e + a* becomes *aya*. Under similar circumstances the diphthong *o* is likewise resolved into its elements, and *o + a* becomes *ava*. The Hindoo grammarians call *e* the Guna (i. e. the strength or power) of *i*, and *o* the Guna of *u*; and they are physiologically correct, for *e* is nothing but *i* pronounced with an increased volume of voice, and *o* is the natural result of *u*, when spoken with greater force. The author considered Bopp as perfectly justified in his assertion, that the Guna of *i* or *u* was nothing more than *a* prefixed to *i* or *u*†, inasmuch as every increase of sound was produced by the addition of the most natural and original vowel.

When a Sanskrit vowel is raised to the highest degree of intensity, the result is called its Vridhhi (i. e. increase). The Vridhhi of any vowel is nothing more than the Guna of that vowel itself subjected to Guna. Thus the Vridhhi of *i* is the Guna of *e*, and may be represented by $a + e = a + a + i = \bar{a}i$. This diphthong has a sound closely resembling that of our long *i*. Again, the Vridhhi of *u* is the

* The vowels are supposed to be pronounced as in Italian.

† This notion is countenanced by the change which takes place in the Sanskrit *r*-vowel. When acted upon by Guna, it becomes *ar*.

Guna of *o*, and may be represented by $a + o$ or $a + a + u = \bar{a}u$. In like manner the Guna of the *r*-vowel is $\bar{a}r$. The change of the Sanskrit vowel into its Guna or Vriddhi diphthong plays an important part in Sanskrit grammar; and it is necessary to take some notice of these letter-changes before we discuss the changes in the Russian vowels corresponding thereto.

The Russian vowels are generally divided into three classes:—

Hard vowels,	<i>a</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>ui</i>
Soft vowels,	<i>ya</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>yu</i>	<i>i</i>
Half vowels,	<i>ye</i>		(')	(').

The vowel *ui* changes to its soft vowel *i*, when it follows one of the gutturals *g*, *k*, *kh*, or one of the palatals, *zh*, *ch*, *sh*, *shch*; and when combined with one of these palatals *o* becomes *e*.

In Russian, as in Sanskrit, the personal endings occasion certain changes in the final consonant of the root:—

<i>d</i>	and	<i>z</i>	become	<i>zh</i> ,
<i>s</i>	<i>kh</i>	<i>sh</i> ,
<i>t</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>ch</i> ,
<i>st</i>	<i>sk</i>	<i>shch</i> ,

and all the roots ending in one of the labials, *b*, *v*, *p*, *f*, *m*, insert *l* before the personal endings.

Having discussed these letter-changes, we may now proceed to the examination of the principles on which the present classification of the Russian verbs is founded. It has been already observed that the infinitive is considered as the verbal root. The Russian infinitive is formed by adding the termination *t'* to the root, either immediately or with the aid of some auxiliary vowel. The author proposed to strip the infinitive of these accessories, and then by allowing for the vowel changes which have already been the subject of comment, to exhibit the verbal root in a form analogous to that of the Sanskrit *dhātu*. Thus from *kovat'* to forge, and *zhevat'*, to chew, he would get *kov* and *zhev*, and considering *ov* and *ev* as the expansion of a Guna diphthong, he would obtain *ku* and *zhu* as the verbal roots. The verbs *ku* and *zhu* may be classed together, the *o* being converted into *e* in *zhevat'*, owing solely to the influence of the palatal *zh*.

The first conjugation of the Sanskrit inserts *a* between the root and the personal endings, and changes the *i* or *u* of the root to its Guna diphthong. The Russian verbs which belong to this conjugation and end in consonants, are all of them accented on the first syllable. This accent the author considered as an indication that the root had once been subjected to Guna. In some few cases the Guna has also left traces of its influence upon the vowels:—

Khrom, to hobble (*khromat* infin.) *kram*, Sansk., to go. The labial *m* requires an *l* after it, and we have for the 2nd person present *khroml-e-sh'*, and for the 3rd person *khroml-e-tt'*. The Sanskrit root *kram* lengthens the *a* when it takes the personal endings, as *krāma-si*, *krama-ti*, &c. (Vide Wilson's Gr. p. 159.) The author considered the broad vowel of the Russian root as representing this long *a* of the Sanskrit verb.

Pech, to cook ; *pach*, Sansk. id. ; *pechet'*, 3rd pers. ; *pachati*, Sansk.

Pad, to fall ; *pat*, Sansk. id.

Br, to take up (*brat'*, infin.) ; *bhr*, Sansk. to bear ; *berett*, 3rd pers. ; *bharati*, Sansk. Here the change of the *r*-vowel to its Guna is obvious.

Smye, to smile (*smyeyat'sya*, inf. *) *shmi*, Sansk. id. ; *smyeett'sya*, 3rd pers. *smeyate*, Sansk. id.

In the second Sanskrit conjugation the personal endings are joined to the root without the intervention of any auxiliary vowel :—

Es, to be ; *as*, Sansk. id. The three persons sing. are *esm'* ; *esi* (for *es-si*) ; *est'* ; and in the Sansk. *as-mi*, *asi* (for *as-si*), and *as-ti*.

Ruid, to cry ; *rud*, Sansk. id.

Liz, to lick ; *lih*, Sansk. id. The 1st person of the Russian verb is *lizhu*, according to a letter-change which has been already noticed.

The third Sanskrit conjugation reduplicates the first syllable of the root. In Russian the reduplication has been lost ; and Russian verbs answering to Sanskrit verbs of this conjugation are all of them conjugated according to the first conjugation.

The fourth conjugation joins the personal endings to the root, by means of an intervening *ya*. In Russian this characteristic is obvious in the verbal derivatives. In both languages most of the verbs belonging to this conjugation are passives or neuters.

Lyub, to love (*lyubit'*, inf.) ; *lubh*, Sansk., to desire, to covet.

Mn, to think ; *man*, Sansk. id. ; *mnyenie*, opinion, meaning, is a derivative.

The fifth Sanskrit conjugation inserts *nu* ; and to this conjugation belong the Greek verbs *δείκνυμι* *ζεύγνυμι*, *ρήγνυμι*, &c. The author considered the "semelfactive verbs," as Heard† calls them, to represent the Sanskrit verbs of the fifth, seventh, and eighth conjugations. *Chi*, to gather (*chinit'*, inf.) ; *chi*, Sansk., to heap ; 1st pers. pres. is *chinu* ; *chinōmi*, Sansk.

Du, to blow (*dunit'*, inf.) ; *dhu*, Sansk., to shake. The 3rd pers. is *dunett'* ; *dhūnute*, Sansk.

Str, to spread ; *str*. Sansk. id. ; *razpro-stranyu* ; *strnōmi*, Sansk.

The sixth Sanskrit conjugation inserts *a* like the first conjugation, but does not change the radical vowel to its Guna :—

Ku, to forge (*kovat'*, inf.) ; *ku*, Sansk. to sound by striking on an anvil. Here indeed we have traces of Guna in the infinitive, but the vowel is not affected in the three persons of the present, *kuyu* ; *kuesh'* ; *kuett'*.

Gud, to sound ; *guj*, Sansk. id. The 3rd person is *guditt'* ; *gujate*, Sansk.

The seventh Sanskrit conjugation inserts *n* before certain endings. Russian verbs corresponding to Sanskrit verbs of this conjugation are declined according to the fifth conjugation.

The verbs also answering to the Sanskrit verbs of the eighth con-

* This is a reflective verb, hence the addition of *sya*.

† Vid. Heard's Russian Grammar, St. Petersburg, 1827. p. 141.

jugation may be classed under the fifth, for most of the verbs end with an “inorganic *n*,” i. e. with an *n* that does not properly belong to the root.

The ninth Sanskrit conjugation inserts *nā*. There are very faint traces of this conjugation in Russian.

The tenth conjugation inserts *i*, which takes Guna before a vowel. The Russians insert *y u*, which becomes *ov* before a hard vowel, but not before the soft vowel of a termination. The Russian verbs, like the Sanskrit, are mostly derivatives from nouns:—

Mudr, to be wise (*mudrovat'*, inf.); *mantr*, Sansk.

Among the Russian derivatives from nouns we have *voruyu*, I steal, from *vor'*, a thief, as the Sanskrit *chorayāmi*, from *chōra*, a robber.

We have already observed, that the Russian preterite is represented by a participle. This participle is formed by adding *l* to the root with the aid of the auxiliary vowel; and it admits of three genders. Thus *dyelat'*, to do, has for its preterite *dyelal*, masc., *dyelala*, fem., and *dyelalo*, neut. The plural is the same for all genders, *dyelali*, we did. This form however expresses only the imperfect tense; to show the action is finished, the prefix *s* or *pro* is added.

The future is expressed by adding the present tense of the verb substantive *buit'* to be, to the infinitive of the verb.

The present imperative is formed by adding an *i* to the root or auxiliary vowel, as *dyelai* do; and by prefixing *s* the Russians get the imperative perfect corresponding to the imperative of the Greek aorist.

There are also two classes of derivative verbs which should not pass without observation, the *Semel-factive* and the *Iterative*, as grammarians have termed them. The first expresses the sudden and single occurrence of an action, as *ya tronull'*, I touched once only; the second expresses iteration, and is formed by inserting *iv* after the root, as *shagivall'*, I have made many steps.

Many other analogies might be pointed out between the verbal forms of the Sanskrit and the Russian; but till the laws of letter-change have been more fully investigated—more particularly as they relate to the Slavish languages—all speculations of this kind must be subject to doubt and uncertainty. The Russian government has lately sent out commissioners to investigate the languages, &c. of the cognate races. The result of their labours can hardly fail to be interesting and important, and when published, will no doubt enable us to carry still further those laws and analogies, the discovery of which has already given to Philology the character of a science.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

MAY 26, 1843.

No. 10.

The Rev. W. JENKINS REES in the Chair.

The following works were laid on the table :—

“Über die Verwandtschaft der malayisch-polynesischen Sprachen mit den indisch-europäischen, von Franz Bopp, Berlin, 1841;” presented by the author.

“Apposition, St. Paul’s School, 1843, and Prolusiones Literariæ præmiis quotannis propositis dignatæ et in D. Pauli Schola habitæ, A. S. H. MCCCXLIII.;” presented by the Rev. H. Kynaston.

A communication was then read :—

“On English Gentile Nouns, and more particularly on their Secondary Use as Names of Districts,” by Edwin Guest, Esq.

Anglo-Saxon gentile nouns are declined according to three different forms: the first is said to be peculiar to this class of words; the second is the common plural of the masculine noun; and the third is the plural of the *n* declension: *Engle* the English, *Wealas* the Welsh and *Seaxan* the Saxons, may serve as examples.

N. Engle	Wealas	Seaxan,
G. Engla	Weala	Seaxna,
D. Englum	Wealum	Seaxum,
A. Engle	Wealas	Seaxan.

As these nouns are mostly found in the genitive and dative cases, in which the three declensions so nearly resemble each other, it is sometimes difficult to say what is the proper termination of the nominative. Many of them also have more than one declension—we have *Englan* as well as *Engle*, *Wealan* as well as *Wealas*, and *Seaxe* as well as *Seaxan*;—and in the Old-English, some of these nouns take nominative endings, to which they were altogether strangers in the Anglo-Saxon.

The gentile noun was very commonly used as a name for the district, and in such case generally retained its plural inflexions. *Norð Hymbre*, in its primary sense, signified the Northumbrians, S. Chr. 954; but this plural noun was not unfrequently used in its secondary signification, and under the date 924, we read of the people that dwell in Northumbre—“*ƿe on Norð hymbrum bugeað.*” So also *Suð-Seaxe* meant the South Saxons; but we are told that in the year 1009 the Northmen harried and burned everywhere in South Seaxe and in Hamton-shire, and in Bearuc-shire—“*æghwer on Suð Seaxum, and on Hamtun scire, and on Bearuc scire.*” Again, all the Somersete—“*Sumersæte ealle*”—met Alfred when he rose against the Danes, A.D. 878; but this plural noun is also very fre-

quently used to signify the shire—"on Somersæton*," in Somerset.

Sometimes however the Anglo-Saxon nouns in *e*, when used as names of districts, seem to have been considered as nouns singular of the masculine gender. In our Old-English dialect these nouns in *e* are rarely found with any but their secondary meaning.

1. Angle. "Of *Angle*† comon. se á siððan stod westig betwix Jutum and Seaxum, East Engle and Middel Angle and Mearce," &c.—*Sax. Chron.* 449.

From Angle, which ever since hath stood waste betwixt Jutes and Seaxe, came the East Engle and the Middle Angle and the Mearce, &c.

2. East-Angle.

"The Denes adde the maystre, tho al was ydo :
And by *Est Angle* and Lyndeseýe hii wende vorp atte laste,
And so hamward al by Kent and slow and barnde vaste."
Rob. Glou. 160.

3. Northumbere.

"The king of West Sex and of Kent and of *Norpomber* the predde."—*Rob. Glou.* 3.

4. "Syx kýnges hii were some tyme, as of Kent, of Westsex, Of *Estangle*, of *Norpomber*, of the Marche, of *Estsex*."

Rob. Glou. 227.

5. "Osricke underking and chief lord of this shier, Which after, as we read, was king of *Northumbere*."

Abbot Malvernes Account of Glou. Abbey.

6. Northweye. "So pat hii wonne al clene *Norpweye* atte laste."

Rob. Glou. 182.

7. Norwaye. "Sume ferdon to *Norwæge*‡, sume to Irlande."

Sax. Chron. 1070.

Some went to Norway, some to Ireland.

8. "Þan was he king of Denmark, Ingland and *Norwaie*."

Rob. Br. 50.

In the following example *Wale* seems to be used in its primary signification, as a gentile noun :—

* The dative plural sometimes ended in *an* or *on*, instead of its regular inflexion *um*.

† In 'The Gleeman's Song,' and in certain parts of the Chronicle a distinction seems to have been made between the name of the district—*Angle* or *Ongle*, and the name of the people—*Engle*. Bede in his version of the above passage gives us both the primary and the secondary meaning of the word *Angle*, "*Porro de Anglis, hoc est de illá patriá, quæ angulus dicitur, et ab eo tempore usque hodie manere desertus, inter provincias Jutarum et Saxonum perhibetur, orientales Angli, &c. sunt orti.*"—*Hist. Ecc.* 16.

‡ The plural noun is also very commonly used, as "into *Norwægum*," into Norway, S. Chr. 1030. The first part of *Nor-wæge* appears to be an early corruption of an old adjective *nort^her*, of which we shall have more to say shortly.

9. Wale "Dis tiping com him eft how *Wale* him betrayed
Perfor is Gascoyn left, and per at werre delayed."
Rob. Br. 263.
10. Cornwalle.
"Neuer in his lyue a fote of land he les .
Scotland and Cumberland and Wales he had in pes
Cornwalle, Lyndsey, and Kent."—*Rob. Br.* 28.
11. Itaille. "Swilce ic wæs on *Eatule* mid *Ælfwine*."
The Gleeman's Song.
Likewise I was in Italy with *Ælfwine*.
12. "Redeth the grete poet of *Itaille*,
That highte Dante."—*Chau. Monkes Tale*.
13. Somersete.
"He nom *sumer-sete* and he nom *dorsete*."—*Layamon*.
He took Somerset and he took Dorset.
14. Dorete. "*Dorsete* and Wiltshire and Somersete also."
Rob. Glou. 3.
15. Sax'. "Our changes (i. e. of language) are all professedly
owing to the conquests, especially of *Sax* and Normandy."
—*Coles' Pref. to his Dictionary*.
16. Southsex'. "The Bishopriche of Salisbury and al *Southsex**
he hadde also."—*Rob. Glou.* 5.

Eatule, in Ex. 11, seems to be merely a secondary application of a gentile noun, derived from the Latin *Itali*, according to the same analogy as *Romane* the Romans (S. Chr. 418), from *Romani*. In the Old-English there are a vast number of names of districts formed on this model:—*Ynde*, Ch. Squieres Tale, K. Alis 2589; *Lyde*, Ch. Monkes T., K. Al. 2588; *Mede*†, K. Al. 1694; *Egipte*, K. Al. 270; *Perse*, Ch. Monkes T.; *Frise*, K. Al. 1698; *Ruce*, Ch. Prol.; *Pruce*, ib.; *Grece*, K. Al. 7915; *Assyre*, K. Al. 3869; *Spaine*, Ch. Monkes T., &c. The gentile nouns, corresponding to these names of districts, must have been known to our language from a very remote period; and they may be found (at least in their inflected cases) in some of the earliest of the Anglo-Saxon writings. The datives *Moidum*, *Persum*, *Egyptum*, *Frysum*, *Froncum*, *Creacum*, &c., are found in 'The Gleeman's Song,' in company with the nominatives *Engle*, *Dene*, *Swæfe*, &c., and most probably belonged to the same declension. Our language is sufficient to account for the existence of these names of districts; but the only thing we can positively assert respecting them is, that they were of Gothic origin. As many of them occur for the first time in the twelfth century, and for the most part in our Romance poems, it is possible they were some of

* In the latter half of the 14th century our language was beginning to feel the changes which resulted in our modern dialect. Rob. of Glou. very commonly rejected the final vowel when it followed a liquid, but very rarely in other cases. He always writes, however, *South Sex*, *East Sex*, &c. instead of *South Sexe*, *East Sexe*, &c.

†

Polemon and Amyntas,
The kings of *Mede* and *Lycaonia*.—*Ant. & Cleop.* iii. 6.

the Gothic elements of French Romance, imported into this country by the Normans. But, on the other hand, it may be observed that our language has exerted upon the Romance of *Oui* an influence far greater than has hitherto been supposed, and that the names corresponding, in the other Romance languages, to the French names in *e*, generally retain the classical ending *ia*. Thus the French has *l'Inde, la Souabe, la Norwège, la Saxe, la Perse, la Friese, la Prusse, la France, la Grèce, &c.*; but the Italian and Spanish have *India, Suevia, Persia, Frisia, Prussia, Francia, Grecia, &c.* The few words which follow the French analogy, may perhaps have been borrowed from that language, as the Italian *Allemagna, Provenza, &c.*, or the Spanish *Noruega, Cornualla, &c.* It will be seen that these district names in *e*, which the Anglo-Saxon appears to have treated as masculine nouns, are considered as feminine nouns in our Romance dialect. This was no doubt owing to the circumstance, that in that dialect *e* was the feminine ending. The *e* was changed into *a* in the Italian and Spanish, according to the analogies which prevail in those languages.

In many of the foregoing examples the final *e* may be considered not so much an inflexion as the element of a compound, or, to speak more precisely, of a derivative. Our national name of *Angle* is derived, by Bede, from the *nook** “*Angulus*,” in which our forefathers lived on the continent. *Angel* in Anglo-Saxon means a hook, and in the Gothic languages it seems to have meant anything that ended in a point; *angel*, a hook, a sting, an ear of corn, &c. (Kilian.). The *Angli* of Tacitus, as is well known, lived at the point where the coast of the Baltic trends suddenly to the northward†. *Northumbere* (Ex. 5.) primarily meant the North Humbersmen; and so closely were the men of the north associated in popular opinion with the estuary of the Humber, that Northumberland is often called in old English *Humberland* simply. (Rob. Glou. 263, 269, &c.) Again *veg-r*‡, in the Icelandic, means a way, and *Norveg-r*, Icel. means Norway, as *Austurveg-r* means the eastern district, or Russia. The Anglo-Saxon *Norwæge*, old English *Norwaie* (Ex. 8.) must be considered as a derivative of *Norveg-r*, and as denoting primarily the men of Norway. Our modern term *Norway* is a mere corruption of *Norwaie*, and not the correlative of *Norveg-r*. *Wale* (Ex. 9.) is connected with the Anglo-Saxon adjective *wealh*§, foreign, and has nothing in common with the Latin *Galli*, as has been supposed by some writers. The compound *Corn-walle* (Ex. 10.), shows that Cornwall, besides

* This etymology was remembered long after Bede's application of it was forgotten. When Wace has driven his Saxons into Thanet, he adds—

Là furent Saison en anglé

Por ce furent Englois clamé, &c.—*Rom. de Brut.* 7293.

† We must not however infer that *Angle* (Ex. 1.) is the dative of *Angel*. That its nominative was *Angle* appears as well from the analogy which is afforded us by other Anglo-Saxon district-names, as from the Old-English name of *East-Angle* (Ex. 2.).

‡ The *r* in *vegr* is merely a nominative ending.

§ This old adjective is still retained in the compound *wal-nut*.

its present Welsh name of *Cernyw* (whence the Latin Cornubia), had a second name *Corn*, a word, which, according to Owen Pugh, still signifies "anything projecting out, a horn*," &c. The derivation of *Somerset* and *Dorset* (Ex. 13, 14.) is involved in great difficulty. The ending *sete* means inhabitants. It is to be found in several Gothic dialects, though never, it is believed, out of composition. With respect to the element *Somer*, we might suppose that as *Somerton*, the old capital of the shire, lies at the extremity of the great inlet, which formerly made Glastonbury an island, *Somer* was a corruption of South-mere. But the Anglo-Saxon orthography of *Sumersæte* and *Sumurtun* (S. Chr. 733), is strong against this hypothesis, and *Somer* will probably turn out to be a Welsh word. *Dorsete*, the inhabitants of *Dor*, answers exactly to Ptolemy's Δουρότριγες. Camden supposes this word to signify dwellers by the sea; *dwr* (Welsh), water, and *trigiau*† (Welsh), to dwell; but *dwr* properly means a stream, and *Durinum* (Dorchester), the capital of the Durotriges was an inland town, situated on the Frome, the river which drains the county. Possibly *dwr* may have been an old name for the river. The etymology of *Seaxe* is even more obscure than that of *Somerset* and *Dorset*.

The old English names *Ynde*, *Lyde*, *Mede*, &c. may have been formed according to an established analogy, from the Latin *Indi*, *Lydi*, *Medi*, &c.; but from a tendency which is constantly shown to accommodate Scriptural names to Anglo-Saxon forms, we may conjecture that *Assyre* was formed on the Scriptural *Assur* rather than on any classical term. *Frise* may have been a derivative, or (if we choose so to term it) the plural, of a word still to be found in the low Dutch—*Fries*, a Frieslander. *Ruce* seems to bear the same relation to *Ros*‡, the ancient name of the people, and probably the same word as our English *Russe*.

17. "The *Russe*, if he be a man of abilitie, neuer goeth out of his house in the winter, but upon his sled, and in summer upon his horse."—*Jenkinson's First Voyage*. Hackluyt.

18. "Cazan is a faire town after the *Russe* or Tartar fashion,—it hath bene a citie of great wealth and riches; and being in the hands of the Tartars, it was a kingdom of itselfe, and did more vex the *Russes* in their warres than any other nation."—*Jenkinson's Voyage*, A.D. 1558. Hackluyt.

Our gentile nouns in *es* were seldom used as names of districts, though we have some notable examples in *Wales*, *North Wales*, and *South Wales*. *Wales* in our early Romance poems was called *Gales*, a

* Geoffrey of Monmouth speaks of Cornwall as the country which "a cornu Britanniae, vel per corruptionem praedicti nominis Cornubia appellatur."

† Several compounds and derivatives are formed from this verb; as *trig-ad*, an abiding; *trig-awl*, dwelling; *trig-va*, a dwelling-place, *ma*, a place; *trig-le*, a dwelling-place, *lle*, a place, &c.

‡ The Byzantine Greeks, to whom we owe the earliest mention of the Russians, generally call them 'Ρῶς—ὁ Δάναπρις ποταμὸς ἐξ οὗ καὶ οἱ 'Ρῶς διέρχονται πρὸς τὴ Μαύρην Βουλγαρίαν, &c.—*Const. Porphy.* 42.

name which quickly passed into the Romance dialects of the continent, in which it is still preserved. The French *Cornuailles* (now more generally used than *Cornuaille*) points to an English *Corn-Wales*. This name must have been soon lost in our language, for it is not met with in our Old-English dialect; but in the Anglo-Saxon we frequently have the gentile noun used, with its plural inflexions, as the name of the district, “& þær gehergodon, ægðer ge on *Corn-Wealum* ge on Norð-Wealum & on Defenum,” and there they harried both in Corn-Wales, and in North-Wales, and in Devon.

19. Engles. " þe *Engles* of this lond þe lordship þei toke,
& haf it ȝit in þer hand, þe Bretons forsoke."—
Rob. Brunne, 8.
20. Wales. " With *Wales* did he so, and þei were neuer trewe,
When he had most to do, þei mad him sorow newe."—
Rob. Brunne, 281.
21. North Wales. " Didius queene Cartismanduas friend,
Venutius rival,—Nero sends
Veranius next, Silures fall
Both aym'd at, but *North Wales* and all
Paulinus foil'd."—
Slatyer's Palæ. Albion, p. 140.
22. Perses. " Of Affryc, and of Grece, of Spayne, and of Syrie,
Of Medes, and of *Perses*, of Ytours, of Lybye."—
Rob. Glou. 201.
23. " Divided is thy regne and it shall be
To Medes and to *Perses* geven."—*Ch. Monke's Tale*.
24. Egyptes. ————— " that chas
Ðat þe *Egyptis* maid so felle
Vpon the folk of Israelle."—*Wynt.* ii. 23.
25. Macedons. " So *Macedons* against the Persians fare."—
Grimoald, Death of Zoroas.
26. Arragons. " That tyme that this crie com of þese barouns,
Com Sir Ion Vescy fro the kyng of *Arragons*."—
Rob. Brunne, 262.
27. Norways. " And there michel wel geslogon, ge *Norweis*, ge
Fleming."—*Sax. Chron. A.D.* 1066.
And there great slaughter made they both of Nor-
ways and Flemings.
28. " After the time of Edwine, the Scots gat the possession
again, and held it (the Isle of Man), till the
Danes and *Norwaies* won it."—*Harr. D. of Brett.* i. 12.
29. " Sweno the *Norways* king craves composition."—*Macbeth*, i. 2.
30. Crimes. " An island called the Island of Merchants, be-
cause it was wont be the place, where all merchants as well

Russes and Cazanites as Nogayans and *Crimmes*, and divers other nations did resorte.”—*Jenkinson's Voy.*, 1550. Hackluyt.

31. Lettowes. “The Emperour is of great power; for he hath conquered much, as well of the Lieflanders, Poles, *Lettoes*, and Swethens, as also of the gentiles called Samoeds.”—*Jenkinson's First Voyage*. Hackluyt.
32. Hanses. “Since the loss of the Narve, the Russ hath devised by all meanes how hee could to dissolve the trade that way, &c., being assured by the *Hanses*, Neitherlanders, and Frenchmen that,” &c.—*Dr. Fletcher's Report to Sir W. Cecil: Ellis's Lett. of Lit. Men.*

Hanses meant the men of the *Hans*, or Association of the Hans Towns; the *Lettowes* were the men of *Letto*, or Lithuania.

33. “In *Lettowe* had he reysed, and in Ruce.”—*Chau. Prol.*
34. “His enemies with whom he hath warres, for the most part are these; *Litto*, Poland, Sweden,” &c.—*Jenkinson's Voyage*. Hackluyt.

Crimes, in like manner, were the men of the *Crim*, or as we now call it, the Crimea. The *Crim* is so called from a town of that name which is supposed to represent the ancient Cimmerium.

Gentile nouns in *an* were very common in Anglo-Saxon—*Englan* the English, S. Chr. 473; *Norð Hymbran* the men of Northumberland, S. Chr. 1081; *Frysan* the Frieselanders, S. Chr. 885, &c. These nouns are also found in the singular, as “Wulfheard *Frysa*,” (S. Chr. 897), Wulfheard the Frieselander. In our later dialects they occur but seldom.

35. Northeren. “Upon the kyng Alfred werre son began,
Bot þorþ pe gode *Norperen* slayn wer ilka man.”
Rob. Brunne, 26.
36. Southron. “He saw the *Sothron* multipliand mair,
And to hym self oft wald he mak his mayne.”
Wallace.

These two names appear to be formed on the now obsolete adjectives *norther* and *souther*. That our language once had adjectives corresponding to the Dutch *noorder*, *zuider*, *wester*, &c. might be inferred from the derivatives *northerly*, *southerly*, *westerly*, &c.; but we are not altogether left to speculate on the matter, for some of them may be found in our literature, though not in our dictionaries.

37. “The cell a chapell had on th' easterne side,
Upon the *wester* side a grove or berie.”—*Har. Orl. Fur*, 41.57.
38. “And all the *easter* parts were full of light.”—*Ib.* 23. 6.

The Anglo-Saxon plurals in *an* were not unfrequently used as names of districts, thus we have *West Seaxan*, Wessex, S. Chr. 1033, “se cýng lædde fyrde into *Wealan**,”—S. Chr. 1081; the king led

* *Wealan* here seems to be the accusative, a case which sometimes follows the preposition *into*. *Wealan*, it is believed, never stands for the dative *Wealum*.

a force into Wales. But the only instances which occur in our later dialect are *Sweden* and *Ripon*. The men of Ripon were called *Hreopsætan*, inhabitants of *Hreop*; and the same root must have produced *Ripon*, but it is difficult to explain its meaning.

Most of the other Gothic languages abound in these names. The German *Schwede* a Swede, *Sachse* a Saxon, *Pole* a Pole, *Preusse* a Prussian, *Hesse* a Hessian, &c., answer to the Anglo-Saxon nouns in *a*, and have for their plurals, *Schweden*, *Sachsen*, *Polen*, *Preussen*, *Hessen*, &c., while the neuters singular *Schweden*, *Sachsen*, *Polen*, *Preussen*, *Hessen*, &c. signify the districts.

Nouns belonging to the *n* declension sometimes take the *n*, not as an inflexion, but as an organic or essential element. Hence we have *Southron*, a man of the South, and *Swethen*, a Swede.

39. "I sent, in company with the Russes goods, all your worship's goods, with a mariner William August, and a *Swethen**, " &c.—
Thom. Alcock's Second Voyage. Hackluyt.

Many gentile nouns were formed from adjectives in *isc*; *Englisce* the English, S. Chr. 924; *Denisce* the Danes, ib.; *Flemisce* the Flemish, S. Chr. 1080, &c. These nouns were sometimes declined like the plural adjective; see "*pæra Deniscra*," S. Chr. 894; and sometimes took the regular inflexions of gentile nouns in *e*: see "*Englisca*," S. Chr. 1066. The final *e* was long preserved in the Old English.

40. Welshe. — "Hii wonede her bi uore anon to Excestre ryȝt,
And *Welsse* were in Engelond vorte he yt adde dyȝt."
Rob. Glou. 276.

41. Corn-Welshe. "Ac natheless the Brutons and the *Cornwalysse* of ȝs kinde
Wenith he be alieue ȝut."—*Rob. Glou.* 224.

42. Englishe. "Saxons and þe *Englisce* and her compaynye,
Adde þo of þis londe, al clene þe maystrye."
Rob. Glou. 227.

43. Danishe. ————— "It sawe,
Henglishe ant *Denishe*, heye ant lowe."
Havelock, 2945.

There is one district-name belonging to this form, which however, in all probability, came from the Danish. In that language *Dansk* means Danish, and *de Danske* the Danes. Our English writers of the sixteenth century, according to the blundering orthography of that period, use *Danske*†, both as an adjective and as a name for the country.

- 44 — "He makes a noise, when he 's on horseback
Like a *Danske* drummer."—
White Devil, &c. Dodsley's Old Plays, 6, 264.

* Vide also *Swethens*, Ex. 31.

† From *Danske* came Shakespeare's *Dansker* (*Hamlet*, ii. 4.). The word, it is believed, is at present unknown to the Danish, though formed from *Dansk*, according to the same analogy as *Tydsker* a German, from *Tydske* German.

45. "Oftentimes have I seene of their workes, made of that oak, so fine and faire as most of the wainescot that is brought hither out of *Danske*."—*Har. Descr. of Br.* 2, 24.

Besides the form in *isce*, we have a second in *iscan*, vide *Deniscan* the Danes, S. Chr. 897. The singular noun in *a** was very common, vide *Suð-Seaxisca* the South Saxon, S. Chr. 1009, and *Hamtunisca* (for *Hamtunisce*) the Hampton Lady, S. Chr. 1035. &c.

Other gentile nouns appear to be formed from adjectives in *ig*; thus in *Beowulf*, 539, we have the phrase *Deniga frea*, lord of the Denige or Danes. Again, in the Chronicle we have *Suthrige* the Southrons, "and Cantware him to crydon, and *Suð-rige* and *Suð-Seaxe*," S. Chr. 823,—and the Cantware turned to him, and the *Suthrige*, and the South Seaxe, &c.; "and he sealde his suna *Æpelstane* Cantwara rice and East Seaxna rice and *Suprigea* and *Suð Seaxna*." S. Chr. 836,—and he gave to his son *Æthelstan* the kingdom of the Cantware, and the kingdom of the East Seaxan, and of the *Suthrige*, and of the South Seaxan. This plural noun was also used to signify the district. We read that a great force was collected "ægðer ge of Cent ge of *Suðrigum* ge of East Seaxum," S. Chr. 921,—both from Kent and from *Suthrige* and from East Seaxe. *Suthrige*† was also used as a singular noun.

46. Surreie. "And Ealdbryht wrecca gewat on *Suprege*, and on *Suð Seaxe*."—*S. Chr.* 722.

And Ealdbryht went an exile to *Suthrege* and to South-Seaxe.

47. "Kyng Egbrýzt was þo prout vor ys segnorye,
Adelwolf ys sone he sende myd vayre bachelerye,
To wynne Kent and Estsex and *Sothereye* myd maystrye." *Rob. Glou.* 258.

48. "Scotland and Cumberland and Wales he had in pes,
Cornwalle, Lyndsay, and Kent, Dorsette and *Surreie*." *Rob. Br.* 28.

49. Normandy. "And ða hwile com Willelm, Earl of *Normandige* into Pefnesea on Sce. Michaelles mæsse æfen."—S. Chr. 1066. And meanwhile came Willelm, Earl of *Normandige* to Pevensea, on the eve of St. Michael's mass.

50. "He 3ef that lond of *Normandy* Bedwer ys boteler,
And that lond of Aungio Kaxe ys panter."—*Rob. Glou.* 187.

51. Lombardy. "And on Octab. Sce Johannis Euangelistæ wæs seo mycele earðbyfung on *Lumbardige*."—S. Chr. 1117. And on the Octave of St. John the Evangelist was the great Earthquake in *Lombardige*.

* From these nouns in *a*, we get the Old-English nouns singular, *an Englishe*, *a Welshe*, *a Frenche*, &c., some of which survived in our modern dialect to the close of the 16th century:

And not a *French* then present, but doth swear

To kill an *English*, if enough there were.—*Drayt., Batt. of Agincourt.*

† So in the Swedish *Norige* is Norway.

52. ————— “The noble man Eneas
To *Lombardye* com, and our first fader was.”—*Rob. Glou.* 65.

53. Picardy. “The false revolting Normans thorough thee
Disdain to call us lord, and *Picardy*
Hath slain their governors.”

Hen. VI. Part. II. 4. 1.

Although *hath* was used as a plural verb (in certain constructions) as late as the time of Shakespeare, we should not be justified in considering *Picardy* in the last example as a gentile noun, for collective nouns are often met with during the sixteenth century in the very same idiom. The Picards also, according to French antiquaries, were so called about the year 1200, on account of the quarrels and bickerings in which they were always engaged at the university of Paris; and whether we admit this derivation or not, the name appears to have originated at too late a period to allow of an English gentile noun in *ye* as one of its derivatives. *Normandye* (Ex. 50.) is formed from a Danish word which was early adopted into the Old English—*Normand* a Norman.

54. “Toward þis land þei drouh to auenture his chance,
Wip *Normandes* inouh of Flandres and of France.”—*Rob. Br.* 70.

We have also gentile nouns in *igan*, thus at the beginning of his laws Cnut is styled “Norðrigena cýning,” king of the Northrigan. With this form we may compare the German collective pronouns; *meinigen* my friends or people, *deinigen* thy people, *ihrigen* your people, &c., as with the form in *ige*, we may compare the Dutch *sommige* some people.

This collective ending *ige* was represented by the Old English *ye* and the modern *y*; and it appears to have played a much more important part in our language than has hitherto been supposed. Philologists consider the ending *y* as representing in general the Latin ending *ia*; but in Anglo-Saxon, the distinction between the Latin and English forms is clearly marked, and we constantly find the Latin terms *Italia*, *Sicilia*, *Sciðþia*, *Hibernia*, &c., brought into juxtaposition with *Suprige*, *Mænige*, *Normandige*, *Lombardige*, *Assirige*, &c. The distinction seems to have been long preserved in the Low Dutch: Kilian writes *Asie*, *Sicilie*, *Bretanie*, *Campanie*, &c., but *Normandije*, *Lombardije*, *Barbarije*, &c.

In some Anglo-Saxon words *c* was occasionally used as a substitute for *g*, and the endings *ige* and *igan* appear to have been sometimes represented by *ice* and *ican*. Dorchester was called in Anglo-Saxon *Dorka-cester*, the city of the *Dorce*, S. Chr. 1067, and also *Dorce ceaster*, S. Chr. 897, and *Dorces ceaster*, the city of *Dorce*, S. Chr. 636. *Dorka* appears to represent the gen. of the gentile noun *Dorige*, the men of *Dor**; *Dorces* is the genitive of the district-name *Dorige*, and *Dorce-ceaster* seems to be a mere compound. Again, the Chronicle tells us, that King Edward went in the year 924, “on Peac lond to *Badecan Wyllan*,” into Peak-land to Bake-

* As to the derivation of *Dorset*, see p. 107.

well. *Badecan-wylle* appears to be a compound—the well of the *Badecan*; and the modern name of Bakewell to be a corruption of another compound *Badice-wylle*, the well of the *Badice*. There are some remarkable remains of Roman baths, still to be seen at Bakewell; and *Badice*, in all probability meant the Bath-people.*

The *Cenomani* were a Gaulish tribe, settled in the province of Maine, and more particularly in the district comprising the diocese of Mans†. Some centuries before Christ, a portion of this people migrated into Italy, and several parts of Britain appear to have been colonized by them, probably at a still earlier period. The *Cenimagni* of Cæsar are generally considered to be the same race as the *Iceni* of Tacitus; Gale fixes a branch of this people near Portsmouth, where their name seems to be still preserved in the hundreds of East and West *Meon*; and traces of them may be discovered in South Lancashire, Cheshire, and some of the adjoining districts. The Chronicle tell us, that in the year 1099 King William drove Earl Elias “of thære *Mænige*‡” from Maine; and in subsequent entries *Mænige* is corrupted into *Mannie*. This word *Mænige* was also the name of more than one English district; for in 923, King Edward ordered “*Mænige ceaster*” in Northumberland to be manned and fortified; and in 1099, Ethelred’s fleet harried *Mænige* in the expedition against Cumberland. *Mænige-ceaster* is considered to be *Man*-chester, the *Man*-cunium of the Romans; and *Mænige* is said to be Anglesey, the *Mona* of Tacitus, and the Welshman’s *Mwn*. It may be observed that the *Cornavii*, who built the Warwickshire Manceter or Manchester (the Latin *Man-duessedum*), are traced to Cheshire by our Celtic antiquarians. We may conjecture then that a branch of the *Iceni* called the *Man* (or by a Latinized compound *Ceno-mani*) peopled South-Lancashire, Cheshire, and Anglesey; and perhaps we shall not go too far in supposing they formed the original Welsh population of the Isle of *Man*, the *Mona* of Cæsar§. If we suppose *Manige* to be pronounced *Manice*, *Manx* will represent the plural in *as*—*Manicas*.

55. “Camden says of the *Manx* that the richer sort imitate the gentry of Lancashire,” &c.,—*Acc. of the Isle of Man*. Newcastle, 1809.

That our gentile nouns in *ige* had correlatives in *igas* seems to be probable from the following considerations:—

In our Romance poems we often meet with the Gentile nouns *Norreis*, *Surreis*, *Londreis* ||, &c. i.e. the Northerns, the Southernns, the

* The importance which was attached to the old Roman baths by our Anglo-Saxon forefathers is sufficiently evident from the name given to the town of Bath. This town was also called *ace mannes ceaster*, the invalid’s city.

† In the 11th century the whole earldom was called *Mans*.—S. Chr. 1807.

‡ Here *Mænige* is treated as a feminine noun. From the form of the genitive *Dorces*, we might perhaps infer that *Dorce* was masculine; but even feminine nouns occasionally made the genitive in *es*.

§ The Welsh called it *Menaw*, whence Pliny’s *Monapia* or *Monabia*.

|| This ending is variously spelled by our romance writers, *ois*, *ais*, *eis*, *oys*, *ays*, &c.; but the most common mode of spelling it is the one adopted in the text.

Londoners, &c. ; these forms may also be found in the old English poems of the fourteenth century.

56. Norreis. " Inglis and Danes and þe gode *Norreis*,
Duke, erle, and baron, and other knyghtes curteis."
Rob. Br. 27.

57. Surreis. " Adelard of Westsex was kȳng of þe empire,
Of Noreis and *Surreis*, guyour of ilk schire."
Rob. Br. 6.

58. Londreis. " Ac þe *Londres* seyn Mellȳt ac (al?) clenliche
vorsoke,
Ac huld hem to her hepenesse."—*Rob. Glou.* 241.

59. " Vnto the *Londreis* þei told þat þei had fonden an hayre,
Was Edmund kosȳn the kȳng, þe *Londreis* wer in speȳr."
Rob. Br. 72.

Our Romance writers certainly considered *Norreis*, *Surreis*, *Londreis*, &c., as belonging to the same class of words as *Franceis*, *Daneis*, *Engleis**, &c. ; and Robert of Brunne seems to have been of the same opinion, for he has once used *Westreis* as a noun singular, just as the Frenchman makes *Anglois* signify the individual Englishman, *l'Anglois*, as well as the race collectively, *les Anglois*.

60. " Sȳward þe gode *Westreis*, Edald þe Vavasoure,
Wilaf kȳng of Merce, he com to þat stoure."—*Rob. Br.* 17.

But a confusion of different forms was almost as common in our Romance dialect as in our modern English, and there is reason to believe that *Norreis*, *Surreis*, &c., are of native growth. When we find the phrase " Earl of Surrey" rendered (sometimes even in the same MS.), both " Counte de Sorays" and " Counte de Soraye," it is difficult to avoid the conclusion, that the two words *Sorays* and *Soraye* are intimately connected with each other, and as we know that *Soraye* represents the Anglo-Saxon plural in *e*, *Suthrige*, it seems fair to conclude that *Sorays* represents an Anglo-Saxon plural in *as*, *Suthrigas*, in like manner as *Norweis* (Ex. 27.) represents the plural *Norwægas*. *Londreis* must be a corruption of *Lond'ner-eis*†.

Our Romance writers carefully distinguish between *Londreis* the Londoners, and *Londres* the town of London; and though *Londreis* be common in our Old-English dialects, there is probably no case in which an English writer has used the thoroughly foreign term of

* The French ending *ois*, the Italian *ese*, and the Spanish *es* have been generally looked upon as representing the Latin *ensis*.

† There is a passage in the 'Roman de Brut', which (if it be rightly transcribed) throws some light on the pronunciation of the word *London* in the 12th century. After tracing its various supposed corruptions, *Lud*, *Lodoin*, *Londoin*, Wace adds
Et *Londe* en Englois dist l'on,

Et nous or *Londres* l'apelon.—*Rom. de Brut.* 1275.

We know our countrymen never called their capital *Londe*, but this orthography may be a Jerseyman's mode of expressing the pronunciation *Lond'ne*. London was called in Anglo-Saxon both *Lunden* and *Lundene*—vide *Lundene-warū*. S. Chr. 1016.

Londres. Yet although *Londres* be of foreign, it is in all probability of Gothic origin, and some observations on its etymology may throw light on the structure of other names of places, which have long since been admitted and are still familiarly used in our language.

The Flemings called Flanders *Vlaendere* and Guelders *Ghelre* or *Gheldre**; while the Dutch named them respectively *Vlaenderen* and *Gelderen*. Our Anglo-Saxon chroniclers called Flanders *Flandran* till the close of the eleventh century; but under the year 1100 we meet with the name of *Flandres*, probably the earliest date at which it appears in any existing document. In our Romance poems we have both *Flandres*, *Londres*, &c., and also *Flandre*, *Londre*, &c., and the name of *Flandre* is not unknown to our Old-English dialect.

61. "Vor Coste Harold broper pat he drof er into *Flandre*
By kыnges day Edward hym selue to gret sclandre
He com anon þo vppen hym."—*Rob. Glou.* 354.

We will first endeavour to trace the origin of the endings *ere*, *eren*, and *ers*.

The *er* in *Londoner*, *Norwicher*†, &c., represents an Anglo-Saxon ending *ere*, which in the plural becomes *eras*; but in other early Gothic dialects the plural was sometimes formed by a change in the final vowel, as in the High Dutch we have *Romari* a Roman, plu. *Romara*. Hence, allowing for the confusion of the vowels of the final syllable, we may understand how it is, that Swedish nouns in *are* remain unchanged in the plural, so that the word *Romare* in that language signifies both a Roman and also the Romans collectively. The Danish seems to have rejected the vowel ending in the singular, but to have retained it in the plural, so that *Romer*, a Roman, *Græker*, a Greek, &c., make in the plural *Romere*, *Grækere*, &c.; and the modern German rejects the vowel in both numbers, so that *Römer* a Roman, remains unchanged in the plural. If we assume that the vowel inflexion was known to the early Low-Dutch dialects, as it was to the early High-Dutch, then we may perhaps infer that *Vlaendere* and *Gheldre* are plural nouns, and that the Dutch *Vlaenderen* and *Geldren* and our own *Flanders* and *Guelders* are formed from them by adding a second plural inflexion; much in the same way as from the Old English *brethre* or *brothre* (for we find *both* forms) we have now got *brethren* and *brothers*.

But there is a second mode of explaining the formation of these endings, *ere*, *eren*, *ers*; and, as these speculations tend to throw light on the all-important subject of *inflexion*, no apology can be needed for its investigation. Certain Anglo-Saxon neuter nouns, *cild* a child, *æg* an egg, *cealf* a calf, &c., form their plurals in *ru*, *cildru*, *ægru*, *cealfu*, &c. *Cildru* became in Old-English *childre* (now *childer*); but the ending *ru* was more generally superseded in that dialect by a double inflexion *ren*, and in the Old-English we have the plural nouns *children*, *eyren* (*ey* Old-Engl. an egg), *lambren* (Wiclif, Jon. 21), &c. These neuter plurals in *ren* are common in the Dutch; *kind* a

* See Kilian.

† Forby introd. 131.

child, *ei* an egg, *kalf* a calf, *lam* a lamb, *blad* a leaf, *lied* a song, *rad* a wheel, *volk* a people, &c., make in the plural *kinderen*, *eijeren*, *kalveren*, *lammeren*, *bladeren*, *liederen*, *raderen*, *volkeren*, &c.; and there are also some nouns belonging to the other genders which form their plurals in like manner, as *rund* masc., an ox, *runderen* oxen; *koen*, fem., a hen, *hoenderen**, fowls, &c. Some of these nouns had a second plural in *ers*, as *kinders* children, *eijers* eggs, *hoenders* fowls, &c. Hence we may perhaps consider *Vlaendere*, *Gheldre*, &c., as plural nouns with an inflexion *re* (instead of a mere vowel inflexion), and the Dutch and English equivalents as nouns with a double inflexion.

Having now discussed the *endings*, we may add a few words as to the other parts of these district-names. The root of *Fland-ers* appears to be the same word as *flemd* exiled, fugitive†. *Flemd* by a common letter-change became the Old-English *flend*, which by a further corruption was sometimes represented by *fleyn*.

62. "Vor hys broperen were aslawe, oper yfleynd echon."

Rob. Glou. 342.

63. "———— Thulke tyme pat ych was

As man fleyne in Normandy, me com mony god cas."

Rob. Glou. 350.

The root of *Guelders* is not an obvious one; that of *Londres* is *Londe*, in which form the Normans appear to have represented the English pronunciation *Lond'ne*. There are many other names of places ending with the termination *res*. *Lang-res* was the ancient capital of the *Ling-ones*.

The collective form in *ry* is pronounced by philologists to be wholly Romance in origin, but that some of the nouns are of pure English growth is more than probable. In the examples,

64. "The Chirche he let halwy as a *childery* masse day,"

Rob. Glou. 349.

65. "Your *aiery* buildeth in our *aierys* nest,"—*Rich. III.* i. 3.

we must certainly consider *childery* and *aiery* (a brood) as formations running parallel with *children* and *eyren* (eggs); and as *children* and *eyren* are formed from the Old-English plurals in *re* by adding a second plural inflexion, so *childery* and *aiery* may be formed by adding the collective ending *y*, of which we have already spoken. That *lad-ry* (*Jam. Dict.*), *nunne-ry* (*nonne* Ang. Sax., a nun), *yeoman-ry*, &c., were formed according to the analogy afforded by *childery* and *aiery*, is probable, for this reason—that we have examples in which these collective nouns, instead of *ry* take the ending *reis*, just as our gentile nouns, instead of the ending *y*, representing the Anglo-Saxon *ige*, sometimes take *eis*, the supposed representative of the Anglo-Saxon *igas*.

* The *d* is merely intrusive, as in our English word *thunder*, *thunor*, Ang. Sax.

† The Flemings have been considered by some writers as the descendants of the conquered Saxons, removed from the Elbe by Charlemagne.

66. "He foundit the colleige of Bothwell and the *Nunreis* of Lynclowden, quilk wes eftir changit in ane colleige of preistis."—*Bellenden Chron.* 16, 12.

Gentile nouns in *ry* are sometimes, though but rarely, used as names of districts.

67. *Jewry*. "Thise justise er atteynt of falshed and folie,
Now comes a new pleynt to destroie þe *juerie*,
þe king was enquere of þer wikked dedes
So many þer were dome on þam salle nedes."
Rob. Br. 247.

68. "In *Jewry* is God known, his name is great in Israel."
—Ps. 76.

69. *Danesry*. "Dardan hight þe cheftayn of þat company,
Sadok sonne of Danmark kȳng *Danesry*."
Rob. Br. 16.

70. *Welshry*. "With lordes þat were nehi he held his parlement
Al ȝole at Denebeghi, after þam alle he sent,
To fend the *Walschrie* with him at þer powere."
Rob. Br. 244.

The gentile nouns *Irishry* and *Englishry* were used up to the close of the sixteenth century, vide Todd's Johns. Dict. The root of *Danesry* is an adjective formed from *Dane*, as *Scots* from *Scot*; and, for a grammatical reason, which we have not at present time to discuss, *Danesry* (in Ex. 69.) must be a district-name.

Ing was a common ending of Anglo-Saxon patronymics; thus in the genealogy of the kings of Wessex we have the passage "Se wæs Cuthaing, Cutha Cȳnricing, Cȳnric Cerdicing," &c. He was son of Cutha, Cutha son of Cynric, Cynric son of Cerdic, &c. The same ending was used to form gentile nouns, as *Eaxȳringas*, the men of Assur ('The Gleeman's Song'); *Idumingas*, the men of Edom (ib.); *Eoferwicingas*, the men of *Eoferwic* (York); *Centingas*, the men of Kent (S. Chr. 1092), &c.* These nouns were very generally used as names of districts.

71. "Hi hæfden þa ofergan East-Engle, &c., and be suðan Temese ealle *Centingas* and Suð Seaxe & *Hæstingas*, &c., & micel on Wiltun scire."—S. Chr. 10, 11.

They had overrun East-Engle, &c., and south of Thames all Kentings (Kent) and South-Sexe and Hastings, &c., and much in Wilton-shire.

The name of *Hastings*, which primarily signified the men of East Sussex, is now the name of their principal town, the *Hæstinga ceaster* of the Chronicle, i. e. the city of the Hastings.

What is the meaning of the root, on which *Hast-ings* has been formed, is unknown; but as to the ending *ing*, we may observe that

* The name of *Fleming* affords us another example. It is generally derived from the Anglo Saxon verb *flyman* to exile.

ung-r (Icel.), *ýng-i* (Icel.) and *ung* (Dan.), mean a youth; and *úngi* (Icel.) and *unge* (Dan.) the young of an animal.

There remains yet another form of English district-names derived from the gentile noun. From *folk* Icel, a people, is derived *fylki* Icel, a shire. The Anglo-Saxon *folc* in composition took the same secondary sense.

72. Norfolk. Norð folc, Ang. Sax.

“The Wantsume riseth in *North-folke* at Galesend in Holt Hundred, &c.”—*Harr. Descr. of Brit.* 12, 1.

73. Suffolk. Suð folk, Ang. Sax.

“Elfride had a kosyn, that kyng was of schelde Northfolk and *Southfolk* of Elfride he held.”—*Rob. Br.*

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

JUNE 9, 1843.

No. 11.

The Rev. JAMES TATE in the Chair.

The following Candidates were elected Members of the Society :—
Horatio Waddington, Esq., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Matthew Davenport Hill, Esq., Queen's Counsel.

George Sloane, Esq., 6, Pump Court, Temple, Special Pleader.

Sir Thomas E. Colebrooke, Bart.

Montagu Webster, Esq., Penns, near Birmingham.

Rev. T. O. Cockaigne, King's College, London.

The following communication was then read :—

“ On the probable Relations of the Picts and Gael with the other Tribes of Great Britain.” By the Rev. Richard Garnett.

It is scarcely necessary to observe, that there are few points of ethnology on which historians and antiquaries have been more at variance with each other, than respecting the real race of those inhabitants of a portion of Caledonia popularly known by the designation of Picts. The difficulty arising from this discrepancy of opinion is increased by the scanty and unsatisfactory nature of the materials now available to those who wish to form an independent judgment. No connected specimen of the Pictish language has been preserved; nor has any ancient author who knew them from personal observation, stated in direct terms that they approximated to one adjoining tribe more than another. They are indeed associated with the Scots or Irish as joint plunderers of the colonial Britons; and the expression of Gildas that they differed in some degree from the Scots in their customs, might seem to imply that they *did* bear an analogy to that nation in certain respects. Of course, where there is such a lack of direct evidence, there is more scope for conjecture; and the Picts are pronounced by different investigators of their history to have been Germans, Scandinavians, Welsh, Gael, or something distinct from all the four. The advocates of the German hypothesis rest chiefly on Tacitus's description of their physical conformation. Dr. Jamieson, assuming that the present Lowland Scotch dialect was derived from them, sets them down as Scandinavians; Bishop Lloyd and Camden conceive them to have been of Celtic race, probably related to the Britons; Chalmers, the author of ‘Caledonia,’ regards them as nothing more than a tribe of Cambrians or Welsh; while Skene, one of the latest authors on the subject, thinks he has proved that they were the ancestors of the present race of Scottish Highlanders.

There is no reason to doubt that there was *some* point of distinc-

tion between the Picts and the adjoining tribes. Nennius describes them as one of the four nations then inhabiting Britain; and Bede represents them as distinct from the Britons and the Scots, both in nationality and language. Innes, who was almost the first to throw a little light upon the chaos of ancient Scottish history, considers them to have been those ancient Caledonian tribes who retained their independence; and that their language differed from that of the colonial Britons in having remained unmixed; while that of the latter was partially Romanized. This supposition is probably not far from the truth. That the Picts were actually Celts, and not of Teutonic race, is proved to a demonstration by the names of their kings; of whom a list, undoubtedly genuine from the fifth century downwards, was published by Innes, from a manuscript in the Colbertine library. Some of these appellations are, as far as we know at present, confined to the Pictish sovereigns; but others are well-known Welsh and Gaelic names. They differ, however, slightly in their forms from their Cymric equivalents; and more decidedly so from the Gaelic ones; and, as far as they go, lead to the supposition that those who bore them spoke a language bearing a remote analogy to the Irish with its cognates, but a pretty close one to the Welsh.

In the list furnished by Innes the names *Maelcon*, *Elpin*, *Taran* (i. e. thunder), *Uven* (Owen), *Bargoit*, are those of personages well known in British history or tradition. *Wrgust*, which appears as Fergus in the Irish annals, is the Welsh *Gwrgust*. *Talorg*, *Talorgan*, evidently contain the British word *Tal* forehead, a common element in proper names; ex. gr. *Talhaiarn*, Iron Forehead; *Taliesin*, splendid forehead, &c. *Taleurgain* would signify in Welsh golden or splendid front. Three kings are represented as sons of *Wid*, in the Irish annals *Foit* or *Foith*. In Welsh orthography it would be *Gwydd*, wild; a common name in Brittany at the present day, under the form of *Gwez*. The names *Drust*, *Drostan*, *Wrad*, *Necton* (in Bede *Naitan*), closely resemble the Welsh *Trwst*, *Trwstan*, *Gwriad*, *Nwython*. It will be sufficient to compare the entire list with the Irish or Highland genealogies, to be convinced that there must have been a material distinction between the two branches. Most of the Pictish names are totally unknown in Irish or Highland history, and the few that are equivalent, such as Angus and Fergus, generally differ in form. The Irish annalists have rather obscured the matter, by transforming those names according to their national system of orthography; but it is remarkable that a list in the 'Book of Ballymote,' partly given by Lynch in his 'Cambrensis Eversus,' agrees closely with Innes, even preserving the initial *w* or *u* where the Gaelic would require *f*. This, by the way, is an independent testimony of the authenticity of the Colbertine list, which, there is reason to believe, was compiled at or near Abernethy; in the very heart of the Pictish territory, and consequently from *original* materials.

The philological inferences to be deduced from this document may be thus briefly summed up;—1. The names of the Pictish kings are not Gaelic, the majority of them being totally unknown both in the Irish and Highland districts, while the few which have Gaelic equi-

valents decidedly differ from them in form. Cineod (Kenneth) and Domhnall or Donnel, appear to be the only exceptions. 2. Some of them cannot be identified as Welsh; but the greater number are either identical with or resemble known Cymric names; or approach more nearly to Welsh in structure and orthography than to any other known language. 3. There appears nevertheless to have been a distinction, amounting at all events to a difference in dialect. The Pictish names beginning with *w* would in Welsh have *gw*, as *Gwrgust* for *Wrgust*, and so of the rest. There may have been other differences, sufficient to justify Bede's statement that the Pictish language was distinct from the British, which it might very well be without any impeachment of its claim to be reckoned as closely cognate.

The remaining direct evidence as to the character of the Pictish language unfortunately lies in a very small compass. Almost the only Pictish word given as such by an ancient writer is the well-known *Pen val* (or, as it appears in the oldest MSS of Bede, *Peann fahel*), the name given by the Picts to the *Wall's End*, or eastern termination of the Vallum of Antoninus. It is scarcely necessary to say the first part of the word is decidedly Cymric; *pen*, head, being contrary to all Gaelic analogy. The latter half might be plausibly claimed as the Gaelic *fal*; *gwall* being the more common term in Welsh for a wall or rampart. *Fal*, however, does occur in Welsh in the sense of *inclosure*, a signification not very remote.

There is a collateral evidence on this subject which does not appear to have been sufficiently attended to. In the Durham MSS of Nennius, apparently written in the twelfth century, there is an interpolated passage, stating that the spot in question was in the Scottish or Gaelic language called *Cenail*. Innes and others have remarked the resemblance between this appellation and the present Kinneil; but no one appears to have noticed that *Cenail* accurately represents the *pronunciation* of the Gaelic *cean fhail*, literally *head of wall*, *f* being quiescent in construction. A remarkable instance of the same suppression occurs in *Athole*, as now written, compared with the *Ath-fothla* of the Irish annalists. Supposing then that *Cenail* was substituted for *Peann fahel* by the Gaelic conquerors of the district, it would follow that the older appellation was *not* Gaelic, and the inference would be obvious. It is proper to observe that the terminus of the wall of Antoninus is commonly placed at Carri-den, several miles to the eastward. There are, however, strong reasons for believing that Kinneil was the real termination, which it would be foreign to our particular province to discuss.

Another evidence, and a decisive one if admitted in its literal import, is that the Irish missionary St. Columba was obliged to employ an interpreter when preaching to the Northern Picts. Skene, who regards the Picts as Gael, endeavours to get rid of this by making the interpretation refer to the Latin Bible, not to the saint's discourse; and quotes Adamnanus as saying merely "verbum Dei per interpretatorem recepto." The entire passage, as it stands in Colganus, is as follows;—"Alio in tempore quo Sanctus Columba in Pictorum provincia per aliquot demorabatur dies, quidam cum tota

plebeius familia, verbum *vitæ* per interpretatorem, *sancto prædicante viro*, audiens credidit, credensque baptizatus est.”—*Adamn. ap. Colganum*, l. ii. c. 32. Here it will be observed, Adamnanus does not say “verbum Dei” which might have been construed to mean the Scripture, but “verbum *vitæ*, *sancto prædicante viro*,” which can hardly mean anything but “the word of life, as it was preached by the saint.” A subsequent biographer will inform us how he understood the passage. There is a voluminous Irish life of St. Columba by Magnus O’Donnell, who states that he diligently consulted all sources of information then extant (*i.e.* about A.D. 1500), among which were some very ancient vernacular biographies. In the abstract of O’Donnell’s work given by the Bollandists, the transaction already referred to is described in the following terms:—“*Demorante viro sancto in prædicta Pictorum regione, ac verbum vitæ gentili populo annunciante, inter alios adfuit quidam plebeius percupidus intelligere quæ prædicabantur. Et quia idiomatis, in quo verba salutis proponebantur, erat ignarus, accivit interpretem, per cuius expositionem mysteria fidei a sancto prædicata attente intelligens, ac aure ac animo devota excipiens, ipse cum uxore, liberis ac tota familia fidem Christi amplexus, salutari lavacro a viro sancto regeneratus est.*”—*O Donnell*, l. ii. c. 75. Here the biographer plainly asserts that the plebeian Pict did not understand St. Columba’s language, “*idiomatis erat ignarus*,” consequently his vernacular language was not Gaelic.

Chalmers, who perhaps maintains the absolute identity of the Picts with the Welsh rather too strongly, observes, that the ancient topographical appellations of the Pictish territory can in general only be explained by the Cymric dialects, giving as one strong point the number of local names beginning with the Welsh prefix *aber*, which he remarks was in several instances subsequently changed by the Gael into *inver*; *Inverin*, previously *Aberin*; *Invernethy*, formerly *Abernethy*. Skene, who felt the force of this argument, tries to get rid of it by maintaining that *aber* is essentially a Gaelic word, being compounded of *ath*, ford, and *bior*, water; and intimating that it cannot be similarly resolved in Welsh. We shall not stop to remark on the utterly gratuitous nature of this etymology, nor to inquire whether the estuary of a large river is a suitable place for a ford; but shall merely observe that the term may be much more satisfactorily accounted for by a different process. There are three words in Welsh denoting a meeting of waters; *aber*, *cynver* and *ynver*; respectively compounded of the particles *a*, denoting juxtaposition, *cyn* (Lat. *con*), and *yn*, with the root *ber* flowing, preserved in the Breton verb *beri* to flow, and all virtually equivalent to our word *confluence*. *Inver* is the only term known in any Gaelic dialect, either as an appellative or in proper names; and not a single local appellation with the prefix *aber* occurs either in Ireland, or the Hebrides, or on the west coast of Scotland. Indeed, the fact that *inver* was substituted for it after the Gaelic occupation of the Pictish territories, is decisive evidence on the point; for, if *aber* was a term familiar to the Gael, why should they change it?

It will be sufficient to mention two more local appellations which can only be explained from the Cymric, viz. the *Ochil* Hills in Perthshire, Welsh *uchel*, high; Gael, *uasal*; and *Brun Albain*, according to the author of the tract 'De Situ Albanie' (supposed to be Giraldus Cambrensis), the name of the Dorsum Britannie, or ridge dividing the Picts from the Scots; Welsh *bryn*, a ridge. The well-known Gaelic appellation is *Drum Albain*. *Ochiltree* in Ayrshire, within the limits of the Strath-Clyde Britons, is easily resolved into *uchel*, high, and *tref* or *tre*, hamlet or habitation; and is only mentioned here for the sake of the analogy. *Bryneich* was the British name of the province of Bernicia, quasi *regio montana*.

The Celtic terms adduced by Chalmers from the old Scottish laws are not so conclusive; most of them admitting of explanation from the Gaelic. Those from the Lowland Scotch dialect would be of some weight, if we knew precisely in what part of Scotland they originated; respecting which there is a lack of information. A sufficient number of Cymric words proper to the district between the Forth and the Frith of Murray, would go a great way towards determining the points in dispute; and it is believed that such might be found, if properly sought for.

Respecting the territorial limits of the Picts, we may observe that much confusion has arisen from regarding Galloway as one of their ancient provinces. It is certain that in the age of Bede, and long after, there were no Picts in Galloway, which is uniformly represented as a British province (occasionally encroached upon by the Northumbrian Saxons), from the fifth to the ninth century. It is believed that Jocelin, abbot of Furness in the tenth century, is the earliest author who describes it as a Pictish territory; and subsequently, the Picts of Galloway are mentioned by several authors, down to the twelfth century. Innes supposes them to have been refugees from the Scottish invasion; and Chalmers regards them as emigrants from Ireland, where there were several tribes of Cruithne, of whom little is known except that they were regarded as distinct from the Irish proper. We have now no materials for deciding this question, any further than by remarking that in this later period the term *Picts* was applied with some laxity of signification. After Kenneth Mac Alpin's conquest, the Scottish kings are often called Pictish kings, and kings of the Picts, because they then ruled over the Pictish territory; and their subjects in Lothian are sometimes called Picts, though the majority of them were probably Saxons. It is therefore possible that the inhabitants of Galloway might be called Picts, though they were not properly such; as the English are popularly called Britons from inhabiting Great Britain.

There has been some dispute respecting the import of the various terms by which the Picts have been designated. The idea that they were called *Cruithneach* by the Gael, because they were eaters of wheat, appears to have no sufficient foundation. Both Lhuyd and O'Brien concur in regarding the word as equivalent to *brithneach*, variegated, from their custom of staining their bodies. Chalmers ingeniously suggests that the Brython, mentioned in the Welsh

Archæology as a tribe distinct from the Lloegrians and the Cymru, were no other than the Picts; and that *Cruithne* is merely the Gaelic form of *Brython*, substituting as usual the guttural for the labial. Cruithneach may however be regularly derived from *cruth*, figure or shape, and in this case both terms, as well as the present name of the Bretons, *Brezounek*, from *Brez*, Welsh *brith*, variegated, would be synonymous with the Latin *Picti*. This appears more probable than Owen's interpretation, *Peithwyr*, quasi, *inhabitants of the plains*, which we know many of them were not; but, on the contrary, tenants of the most rugged mountain districts in all Britain.

It will be easily understood from the preceding remarks, that the writer considers Skene's hypothesis of the substantial identity of the Picts with the present Highlanders as totally ungrounded. There are, probably enough, descendants of the Picts both in the Highlands and the Lowlands; but that the Scoto-Irish race gained the predominance in the former district, is demonstrated by the language, which does not differ in any essential point from that of the opposite coast of Leinster and Ulster; bearing, in fact, a closer resemblance than Low German does to High German, or Danish to Swedish. The Albanic Duan, of the twelfth century, follows the analogy of the Irish Grammar throughout, and a recent Gaelic grammarian (Munro), observes that Knox's Liturgy and other compositions of the sixteenth century do not differ from the Irish of the same period. It is believed that no instance exists of a similar identity of speech between tribes of different origin, as the Picts are allowed to have been, separated by their geographical position and living for centuries under a distinct government. If we suppose the Dalriadic Scots, whose migration from Ireland to the west coast of Scotland in the fifth century is a well-ascertained historical fact, to have eventually become superior in numbers to the Picts, as we know they did in military and political power, the final prevalence of their language is easily accounted for.

The subject of the general relation of the Irish or Gaelic to the other Celtic tongues, is too copious and difficult to be fully discussed at present. It resembles the Welsh in many points of grammatical structure, in a considerable proportion of its vocabulary, and in that remarkable system of initial mutations of consonants which distinguishes the Celtic languages from all others in Europe. On the other hand, it differs in several material points, particularly in having a distinct genitive and dative case; the latter, in the plural number, bearing an evident analogy to the Sanscrit and Latin, to which languages it also approximates in many affixes and other formatives, unknown in Welsh. To determine its exact place in the Indo-European family is perhaps the most difficult problem in philology. When all has been separated which can be fairly considered as analogous to the Cymric and Armorican, there still remains a great preponderance of terms which cannot be satisfactorily referred to any one race known to have inhabited Europe. Some are found in Finnish; many more in Slavonic and the Romance dialects; while those corresponding to Sanscrit vocables are perhaps the most nu-

merous and remarkable of any. Some philologists have expressed an opinion that the Scoti or Milesians were of Germanic race; or at all events had been subjected to Germanic admixture: and the language, as we now find it, certainly gives some countenance to that hypothesis. For example, *teanga* is the only word current for *tongue*, totally different from the Welsh *tavod*; and *leighis*, to heal, *leagh*, physical, are evident counterparts of our Saxon term *leech*. The following words, constituting a very small proportion of what might be produced, may serve as further specimens of the class;—

Beit, both.
 Coinne, woman, quean.
 Daor, dear.
 Dorcha, dark.
 Dream, company, people; A.S. truma; O.E. trome.
 Drong, throng.
 Faigh, to get, obtain; *Dan.* faae.
 Feacht, fight.
 Frag, woman, wife; *Germ.* frau.
 Lairè, thigh; *Dan.* laar.
 Lagh, law.
 Lab, lip.
 Laoidh, poem, lay; *Germ.* lied.
 Lasd, loading, ballast; *Germ.* last.
 Leos, light; *Isl.* lios.
 Lumhan, lamb.
 Sàr, very, exceeding; *Germ.* sehr.
 Seadha, saw.
 Seal, a while, space of time; A.S. sael, sel.
 Seam, a peg or pin; *Dan.* söm, nail.
 Sgad, loss, misfortune; *Dan.* skade.
 Sgaoil, separate, disperse; *Sw.* skala.
 Sgeir, rock in the sea, skerry; *Isl.* skèr.
 Sgarbh, a cormorant; *Isl.* skarfr.
 Snaig, creep, *sneak*.
 Sneachd, snow.
 Sliochd, family, race; *Germ.* geschlecht.
 Slug, swallow; *Germ.* schlucken.
 Smachd, power, authority; *Germ.* macht.
 Smeoraich, smear.
 Snaidh, cut; *Germ.* schneiden.
 Spaisdrich, walk; *Germ.* spazieren.
 Spàr, a beam or joist.
 Sreang, a string.
 Sreamh, a current, stream.
 Steagaim, parch, fry; *Sw.* steka, to roast, fry, broil.
 Strith, strife; *Germ.* streit.
 Trath, time, season; A.S. thrag; O.E. throw.

Some of the above terms may have been introduced in the ninth and following centuries by the Northmen; but many of them occur in the oldest known monuments of the language; they are also accompanied by many compounds and derivatives, which is commonly regarded as a proof of long naturalization; and are moreover current in Connaught, where the Danes never had any permanent settlement. One of the most remarkable indications of a Teutonic affinity is the termination *nas*, or *nis*, exactly corresponding to our

ness in *greatness, goodness* ; *ex. gr.* *breitheamnas*, judgement, *fiadhnis*, witness, &c. This affix is too completely incorporated in the language to be a borrowed term, and it moreover appears to be *significant*, in the sense of *state, condition*, in Irish, though not in German. As far as the writer knows, it is confined to the Gaelic and Teutonic dialects. The Irish *sealbh*, property, possession ; *adj. sealbhach, proprius*, would also furnish a plausible origin for the German *selber, self*, a word which has no known Teutonic etymology. These approximations and various others which might be pointed out, not only to German but to Latin, Sanscrit, and other languages of their class, seem to show that the distinctive portion of the Gaelic tongues is of comparatively later introduction into the west of Europe, and that the Cymric and Armorican have more faithfully preserved the peculiarities of the ancient Celtic. For instance, the entire want of *cases* in Welsh, Cornish and Breton, is a mark of antiquity exhibited by no other European tongue, in its original condition.

Respecting the affinity of the Gaelic dialects to each other, it will be sufficient to say that Irish is the parent tongue ; that Scottish Gaelic is Irish stripped of a few inflections ; and that Manks is merely Gaelic with a few peculiar words and disguised by a corrupt system of orthography.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

JUNE 23, 1843.

No. 12.

The Rev. JAMES TATE in the Chair.

The Chairman stated that the Council had been furnished, through the liberality of Mr. Yates, with two or three hundred copies of a lithograph, intended to illustrate a paper, which appeared in Abstr. No. 2, entitled "Some Remarks on a Statue of Endymion, illustrative of a Passage in Lucian." The lithograph could not be transmitted through the post, without being folded and thereby injured, but any member might procure a copy, on application at the London library.

John Hills, Esq. Barrister at Law, was elected a member of the Society.

Professors Herman, Lassen, and W. K. Grimm were proposed to the Society for election as Honorary Members.

The Chairman read the report, which had been laid before the Council, agreeably to Rule VI. on the claims of Professor Herman; after which the reports on the claims of Professors Lassen and W. K. Grimm were read (in the absence of Professor Wilson and Mr. Kemble) by the Secretary.

A paper was then read:—

"On the Descent of the Magyar from the Ancient Persians." By Joseph Von Szabó, Professor of History, Lyceum, Oedenburg. Communicated by Mr. Bland.

The author considered the name of *Magyar* to be a compound—*Mag-ar*. The first element of this compound is the same word as the *Máγοι* of Herodotus (i. 101), and *Ar* probably represents the name of *Ἀριοι* (vii. 61). The Mahometans still use the name of *Mug* as a term of contempt for the Parsis; and the ancient Magyar used to call such of their countrymen as continued heathen, *Mokany*.

Herodotus mentions a Median race, the *Sigynnæ*, as dwelling in his time north of the Danube, and probably in the country of the Magyar; but the author considered his countrymen as "the descendants of the Magi Ariorum, that is, of the Medes, Persians, Parthians, and Neo-Persians, who were driven out by the Arabs, in 636, to the Caucasian mountains." Although Constantinus Porphyrogenitus generally gives to the Magyar the name of *Τούρκοι*, yet he also ex-

pressly states that they were called Σαβαρτοὶ ἄσφαλοι (c. 38), that is Sabean *Persians*, for Herodotus tells us that the Persians were formerly called Ἀπταῖοι (vii. 61). Procopius mentions the Magyar under the name of Σαβειροί*, a word which may be resolved in like manner—the Sabean Ἀριοί†; and the country round Tiflis, in all probability, got its name of *Sabarato* as having been one of the localities inhabited by this people. Cinnamus, in his History (vol. i. p. 1), says: The Magyars were τοῖς Πέρσαις ταυτοφρονούντες, and that those who remained in Greece, in one of the early expeditions were called Σῶβα, Magyars‡.

The Greek word Οὐγγροί, and Latin Hungari may perhaps be a compound—*Hunni Gurii*, that is the Huns of Georgia.

The author believed that most of the Persian names would be found to be significant in the Magyar language. He considered Smerdis to be the Magyar word *esmeretes*§, known; and Ochus to be *okos*, wise. Ormuzd was the Magyar *Erjemesztö*, contractedly *Ormesztö*, the quickener, one that gives life; and Ahriman was *Armány*, whence the expression *te armanyos*, thou sly one! *Κάνδus*, the name of a Persian garment, was the same word as *köntös*, a coat.

Many of the terms of worship used by the Parsis are also to be found in Magyar. Thus:—"Daroun=Magyar *Tarhonya*, eine auf der Sonne getrocknete Mehlspeise; Tchepie=Mag. *Tsipö Vas*, pincette de fer, Zange; Miedz=Mag. *Müveszet* contr. *müészet*, fructificatio; keish=Mag. *köz*, kaum; Atishdan=Mag. *a'tüz tanya* (now Tüzhely) der Herd; Aderan=Mag. *A'derunye*, das Dämmerungslicht; Sourak=Mag. *Szüröke*, seicher; Barsom=Mag. *Berzseny*, Fürbesholz; Barashnom no shabe=Mag. *Verászúnomo szoba*, contractedly *Veraszuno szoba*, das Wachtzimmer; Havan=Mag. *Káván*, cinctura putei superne; Mobed=Mag. *Mühvéd*; Herbed=Mag. *Orvéd*, Beschützer (Conf. Wahl, 194, 294); Destur=Mag. *Tisztur*, Amtherr or Amtmann; Desturan destur=*Tiszturon tisztur*, ein Amtmann über den Amtmann, &c. Conf. Anquetil du Perron.—Zend Avesta, iv. p. 529, *et seq.*"

Many names of towns, hills, rivers, &c. are found alike in Hungary and in Persian districts. Kirmend may be compared with *Körmind*; Tarku with *Tarkö*; Badakhshan with *Badacsony*, a wine mountain in the Zala district; Sagh with *Sag*, a mountain in the Eisenburg district; Baskiri (Sogdiana Antiquorum) with *Vasköriek*, where *vas* is iron; the name of the river Cyrus with *Körös*, &c.

The author stated that he had been able to explain, to a great

* De Bello Persico, i. 15, and De Bello Gothico, iv. 11. See also Agath. Schol. iv. 85: καὶ Οὐννοὶ Σαβειροί.

† Conf. Von Hammer. on the origin of the name of *Sufis*, in the Wiener Zeitschrift, &c. May 1828.

‡ Conf. Anonymi Hist. Ducum. 1.

§ It may be observed, that the Magyar *sz* is pronounced like *s*; *s*, like *sh*; *cs*, *ts*, like our *ch*; *cz*, *tz*, like the German *z*; and that the *y* of *gy*, *ly*, *ny*, *ty*, performs the part of a liquid, and does not constitute a distinct syllable.

extent, the Persepolitan inscriptions, as given in Lassen's *Keilinschriften* (Bonn, 1836). He believed them to be pure Zend, but the inflated style rendered them very difficult to translate. A passage was given, as a specimen, in the old Persian, accompanied with translations in Magyar and German.

After the reading of this paper a discussion arose upon the question, how far the arguments which had been laid before the meeting could be considered as shaking the generally received opinion, that the Magyar was one of the Finnish languages.

The following paper was read before the Society on the 9th of June, but, owing to accidental circumstances, did not appear in the abstract of the proceedings of that evening.

"On the Doctrine of the Cæsura in the Greek Senarius." By Professor Latham.

In respect to the cæsura of the Greek tragic senarius, the rules, as laid down by Porson in the Supplement to his Preface to the *Hecuba*, and as recognized, more or less, by the English school of critics, seem capable of a more general expression, and, at the same time, liable to certain limitations in regard to fact. This becomes apparent when we investigate the principle that serves as foundation to these rules; in other words, when we exhibit the *rationale*, or doctrine, of the cæsura in question. At this we can arrive by taking cognizance of a second element of metre beyond that of quantity.

It is assumed that the element in metre which goes, in works of different writers, under the name of *Ictus Metricus*, or of *Arsis*, is the same as accent, *in the sense of that word in English*. It is this that constitutes the difference between words like *ty'rant* and *re-súme*, or *súrvey* and *survéy*; or (to take more convenient examples) between the word *Aúgust*, used as the name of a month, and *au-gúst*, used as an adjective. Without inquiring how far this coincides with the accent and accentuation of the classical grammarians, it may be stated that, in the forthcoming pages, *arsis*, *ictus metricus*, and accent (*in the English sense of the word*), mean one and the same thing. With this view of the *arsis*, or *ictus*, we may ask how far, in each particular foot of the senarius, it coincides with the quantity.

First Foot.—In the first place of a tragic senarius it is a matter of indifference whether the *arsis* fall on the first or second syllable; that is, it is a matter of indifference whether the foot be sounded as *ty'rant* or as *re-súme*, as *Aúgust* or as *au-gúst*. In the following lines the words *ἦκω*, *παλαι*, *εἶπερ*, *τινας**, may be pronounced either as

* The mark (') placed over a syllable indicates the *arsis*. In order to exhibit this, it is convenient to omit the grammatical accentuation altogether. Beyond this two other points may here be noticed:—1. That no account is taken of trisyllabic feet; the sixth syllable meaning the last part of the third foot, even though that portion of the line, owing to the presence of tribrachs, dactyles, or anapaests,

ἤ'κω, πα'λαι, εἰ'περ, τί'νας, or as ἤκω', παλαι', εἰπερ', τινά's, without any detriment to the character of the line wherein they occur.

ἤ'κω νεκρῶν κευθμῶνα καὶ σκοτοῦ πυλάς.
πα'λαι κυνηγετοῦντα καὶ μετροῦμενον.
εἰ'περ δίκαιος εἰσθ' ἐμος τὰ πατροθεν.
τί'νας ποθ' ἐδράς τασδε μοι θοαζέτε.

or,

ἤκω' νεκρῶν κευθμῶνα καὶ σκοτοῦ πυλάς.
παλαι' κυνηγετοῦντα καὶ μετροῦμενον.
εἰπερ' δίκαιος εἰσθ' ἐμος τὰ πατροθεν.
τινά's ποθ' ἐδράς τασδε μοι θοαζέτε.

Second Foot.—In the second place, it is also a matter of indifference whether the foot be sounded as *Áugust* or as *augúst*. In the first of the four lines quoted above we may say either *νε'κρων* or *νεκρῶ'ν*, without violating the rhythm of the verse.

Third Foot.—In this part of the senarius it is no longer a matter of indifference whether the foot be sounded as *Áugust* or as *augúst*; that is, it is no longer a matter of indifference whether the arsis and the quantity coincide. In the circumstance that the last syllable of the third foot must be accented (in the English sense of the word), taken along with a second fact, soon about to be exhibited, lies the doctrine of the penthimimer and hepthimimer cæsuras.

The proof of the coincidence between the arsis and the quantity in the third foot is derived partly from *à posteriori*, partly from *à priori* evidence.

1. In the Supplices of Æschylus, the Persæ, and the Bacchæ, three dramas where licences in regard to metre are pre-eminently common, the number of lines wherein the sixth syllable (*i. e.* the last half of the third foot) is without an arsis, is at the highest sixteen, at the lowest five; whilst in the remainder of the extant dramas the proportion is undoubtedly smaller.

2. In all lines where the sixth syllable is destitute of ictus, the iambic character is violated: as

Θρηκὴν περᾶσαντες μογὶς πολλῶ πονῶ.
Δυοὶν γεροντοῖν δὲ στρατηγεῖται φύγη.

These are facts which may be verified either by referring to the tragedians, or by constructing senarii like the lines last quoted. The only difficulty that occurs arises in determining, in a dead language like the Greek, the absence or presence of the arsis. In this matter the writer had satisfied himself of the truth of the two following propositions:—1. That the accentuation of the grammarians denotes some modification of pronunciation other than that which

should coincide with the seventh or eighth syllable. 2. That words followed by enclitics are dealt with as single words. It is well known that both these modes of expression are in accordance with the current views of the Greek metres.

constitutes the difference between *Aúgust* and *augúst*; since, if it were not so, the word ἄγγελον would be sounded like *merrily*, and the word ἀγγέλων like *disáble*; which is improbable. 2. That the arsis lies upon radical rather than inflectional syllables, and out of two inflectional syllables upon the first rather than the second; as βλέπ-ω, βλέψ-α'σ-α, not βλέπ-ω', βλέψ-ασ-α'. The evidence upon these points is derived from the structure of language in general. The *onus probandi* lies with the author who presumes an arsis (accent in the English sense) on a *non*-radical syllable. Doubts, however, as to the pronunciation of certain words, leave the precise number of lines violating the rule given above undetermined. It is considered sufficient to show that wherever they occur the iambic character is violated.

The circumstance, however, of the last half of the third foot requiring an arsis, brings us only half way towards the doctrine of the cæsure. With this must be combined a second fact, arising out of the constitution of the Greek language in respect to its accent. In accordance with the views just exhibited, the author conceives that no Greek word has an arsis upon the last syllable, except in the three following cases:—

1. Monosyllables, not enclitic; as σφω'ν, πα'ς, χθω'ν, δμω'ς, νω'ν, νυ'ν, &c.
2. Circumflex futures; as ρεμω', τεμω', &c.
3. Words abbreviated by apocope; in which case the penultimate is converted into a final syllable: δω'μ', φειδεσ'θ', κεντει'τ', εγω'γ', &c.

Now the fact of a syllable with an arsis being, in Greek, rarely final, taken along with that of the sixth syllable requiring, in the senarius, an arsis, gives as a matter of necessity, the circumstance that, in the Greek drama, the sixth syllable shall occur anywhere rather than at the end of a word; and this is only another way of saying, that, in a tragic senarius, the syllable in question shall generally be followed by other syllables in the same word. All this the author considers as so truly a matter of necessity, that the objection to his view of the Greek cæsure must lie either against his idea of the nature of the accents, or nowhere; since that being admitted, the rest follows of course.

As the sixth syllable must not be final, it must be followed in the same word by one syllable, or by more than one.

1. *The sixth syllable followed by one syllable in the same word.*—This is only another name for the seventh syllable occurring at the end of a word, and it gives at once the hepthimimer cæsure: as

Ἦκω νεκρῶν κευθμῶ'να καὶ σκοτοῦ πυλάς.
Ἰκτηριοῖς κλαδοῖ'σιν ἐξεστεμμενοί.
Ὅμον τε παιανῶ'ν τε καὶ στεναγμάτων.

2. *The sixth syllable followed by two (or more) syllables in the same word.*—This is only another name for the eighth (or some syllable after the eighth) syllable occurring at the end of a word; as

Οδμη βροτειων αἵματων με προσγελα.
 Λαμπρους δυναστας ἐμ'πρεποντας αιθερι.

Now this arrangement of syllables, taken by itself, gives anything rather than a hepthimimer; so that if it was at this point that our investigations terminated, little would be done towards the evolution of the *rationale* of the cæsure. It will appear, however, that in those cases where the circumstance of the sixth syllable being followed by two others in the same words, causes the eighth (or some syllable after the eighth) to be final, either a penthimimer cæsure, or an equivalent, will, with but few exceptions, be the result. This we may prove by taking the eighth syllable and counting back from it. What *follows* this syllable is immaterial: it is the number of syllables in the same word that *precedes* it that demands attention.

1. *The eighth syllable preceded in the same word by nothing.*—This is equivalent to the seventh syllable at the end of the preceding word; a state of things, which, as noticed above, gives the hepthimimer cæsure.

Ανηριθμον γελα'σμα παμ|μητορ δε γη.

2. *The eighth syllable preceded in the same word by one syllable.*—This is equivalent to the sixth syllable at the end of the word preceding; a state of things, which, as noticed above, rarely occurs. When however it does occur, one of the three conditions under which a final syllable can take an arsis, must accompany it. Each of these conditions requires notice.

a). With a non-enclitic *mono*-syllable the result is a penthimimer cæsure; since the syllable preceding a monosyllable is necessarily final.

Ἑκω σεβιζων συ'ν κλυ'ται|μνηστρα κρατος.

No remark has been made by critics upon lines constructed in this manner, since the cæsure is a penthimimer, and consequently their rules are undisturbed.

β). With *poly*-syllabic circumflex futures constituting the third foot, there would be a violation of the current rules respecting the cæsure. Notwithstanding this, if the views of the present paper be true, there would be no violation of the iambic character of the senarius. Against such a line as

καγω το σον νεμω' ποθει|νον αυλιον

there is no argument *à priori* on the score of the iambic character being violated; whilst in respect to objections derived from evidence *à posteriori*, there is sufficient reason for such lines being rare.

γ). With *poly*-syllables abbreviated by apocope, we have the state of things which the metrists have recognized under the name of quasi-cæsure; as

Κεντετε μη φειδε'σθ' εγω |τεκον Παριν.

3. *The eighth syllable preceded in the same word by two syllables.*—

This is equivalent to the fifth syllable occurring at the end of the word preceding; a state of things which gives the penthimimer cæsure; as

Οδμη βροτειων αἵματων| με προσγελα.
 Λαμπρους δυναστας εμ'πρεπον|τας αιθερι.
 Αψυχον εικω προ'σγελω|σα σωματος.

4. *The eighth syllable preceded in the same word by three or more than three syllables.*—This is equivalent to the fourth (or some syllable preceding the fourth) syllable occurring at the end of the word preceding; a state of things which would include the third and fourth feet in one and the same word. This concurrence is denounced in the Supplement to the Preface to the Hecuba; where, however, the rule, as in the case of the quasi-cæsure, from being based upon merely empirical evidence, requires limitation. In lines like

Και τάλλα πολλ' επει'κασαι| δικαιον ην,

or (an imaginary example),

Τοις σοισιν ασπιδη'στροφουσι|ιν ανδρασι,

there is no violation of the iambic character, and consequently no reason against similar lines having been written; although from the average proportion of Greek words like *επεικασαι* and *ασπιδηστροφου-σιν*, there is every reason for their being rare.

After the details just given, the recapitulation is brief.

1. It was essential to the character of the senarius that the sixth syllable, or latter half of the third foot, should have an arsis, ictus metricus, or accent in the English sense. To this condition of the iambic rhythm the Greek tragedians, either consciously or unconsciously, adhered.

2. It was the character of the Greek language to admit an arsis on the last syllable of a word only under circumstances comparatively rare.

3. These two facts, taken together, caused the sixth syllable of a line to be anywhere rather than at the end of a word.

4. If followed by a single syllable in the same word, the result was a hepthimimer cæsure.

5. If followed by more syllables than one, some syllable in an earlier part of the line ended the word preceding, and so caused either a penthimimer, a quasi-cæsure, or the occurrence of the third and fourth foot in the same word.

6. As these two last-mentioned circumstances were rare, the general phænomenon presented in the Greek senarius was the occurrence of either the penthimimer or hepthimimer.

7. Respecting these two sorts of cæsure, the rules, instead of being exhibited in detail, may be replaced by the simple assertion that there should be an arsis on the sixth syllable. From this the rest follows.

8. Respecting the non-occurrence of the third and fourth feet in the same word, the assertion may be withdrawn entirely.

9. Respecting the quasi-cæsure, the rules, if not altogether withdrawn, may be extended to the admission of the last syllable of circumflex futures (or to any other polysyllables with an equal claim to be considered accented on the last syllable) in the latter half of the third foot.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

NOVEMBER 24, 1843.

No. 13.

Professor MALDEN in the Chair.

The following works were laid on the table :—

“Organism der Sprache von Dr. Karl Ferdinand Becker. Zweite neubearbeitete Ausgabe. Frankfurt am Main, 1841.” Presented by the author.

“The Numismatic Chronicle,” No. 21. Presented by the Numismatic Society.

The Chairman read the Report which had been handed in to the Council, agreeably to Rule 6, on the claims of Professor Immanuel Bekker to be elected an honorary member of the Society.

The following communications were then read :—

1. “On the Berber* Language of Mount Atlas, generally supposed to be that of the ancient Mauritians.” By F. W. Newman, Esq.

Since the publication of Shaw’s Travels, information has gradually accumulated as to the wide geographical surface occupied by the dialects of the Berber tongue ; and it appears to be now recognized by ethnographers as an established fact, that setting aside the imported Arabic, this single idiom spreads over North Africa southward to the furthest limit of the Great Desert, and eastward till it meets the tribes of the Tibboos in the longitude of Fezzan. Although Venture’s Vocabulary (which is said to be of considerable extent) and a few complete sentences of the language have been for many years accessible, yet the author believed that no materials were at hand in Europe for entering on a critical analysis of its structure and relations until the year 1833, when the Bible Society published the first twelve chapters of the Gospel of St. Luke in the Berber language.

The English Americans claim the merit of having effected this object. From the first Number of the American Oriental Society it appears that Mr. Du Ponceau instituted investigations into the subject, first through the late Mr. Shaler, American consul at Algiers, who furnished copious specimens of the language, and afterwards

* These Berbers must not be confounded with the Nubians of the Nile, who are often called by a similar or identical name.

through Mr. Hodgson, late consul at Tunis. Under the superintendence of the last gentleman, who is a zealous inquirer into African ethnography, the version of St. Luke already alluded to was made, by a Kabyle Berber of the mountains near Algiers (Penny Cycl. art. Berbers); and Mr. Hattersley is also named as having superintended the publication of the MS. when the Bible Society had purchased it of Mr. Hodgson. The author's attention having been called to this version in 1835 by Dr. J. Cowles Prichard, he compiled, in 1836, an 'Essay towards a Grammar' of the language, which was printed in the West of England Journal; but having lately, through the kindness of Mr. Jowett, Editorial Superintendent to the Bible Society, obtained the loan of the Berber MS. of the four Gospels, written as it would seem by the same hand, and alike obtained through Mr. Hodgson, he was now induced to modify some of the conclusions at which he formerly arrived, and he thought his investigations would not be altogether without interest to the Philological Society. He should probably hereafter publish as extended a dictionary and grammar as his materials would enable him to do; believing that a well-defined acquaintance with this tongue would afford an advantageous fixed point for ethnographers in proceeding towards the languages of Soudan.

The general conclusion at which the author had arrived was, that the Berber tongue has the most deeply-seated and all-pervading analogies with the Hebrew and Arabic; from which nevertheless it differs in vocabulary, probably quite as much as German from Greek. In conformity with the terms Indo-European and Syro-Arabian, (as Dr. Prichard styles the languages generally called "Shemitic,") he proposed to employ the adjective *Syro-African*, to include (*with* the Syro-Arabian) the Berber and other African languages which answer similar conditions. If, as is probable, the Amharic shall be judged, like the Gheez, to belong to this group, it would be a matter of much interest to learn whether the chain of kindred languages is or is not broken, between Abyssinia and the highlands of Atlas. The nation of the Tibboos intervenes, whose physical peculiarities may prepare us to believe that they, like the Berbers, are to be associated more with the Moor and the Arab than with the Negro; and if any traveller could procure ample specimens of translation into that tongue, it would be a useful addition to our knowledge.

The details on which the author founded his opinion concerning the Berber were the following; and tedious as they may seem, they afford the only means by which a right judgement can be formed on the subject.

§ 1. *On the Sounds of the Language.*—The consonants demanded by the Berber language are nearly identical with those of Arabic. The P is wanting in both. The two harsh letters of the latter tongue, *Dad* and *Za* (ظ and ض), are deficient in the Berber; and insofar it approximates to the Hebrew; on the other hand, it has not only the *Ain*, so characteristic of the Syro-Arabian, but also its kindred *Ghain*; and the *Kha* as well as *Hha*. It distinguishes D

and T from their aspirates*, yet not as the Arabs do; for with the latter the distinction is radical and significant, but with the Berbers, as with the Hebrews, it is purely euphonic. In fact, except in a very few words in which the accuracy of the transcript may be doubted, it would appear that in Berber the aspirate falls away from D and T when doubled, according to the well-known law of Dagesh Forte in Hebrew. Within the limits of Arabic itself, the K and G are known to have two different sounds, exactly the same as in Italian, though without reference to the nature of the vowel following them; the Arabians preferring the soft and the Africans the hard sound: moreover the deep soft K of the Arabs, formed at the root of the tongue (which we call Koph or Qâf), is apt to change into a corresponding G-sound in the region of Bagdad and the Persian Gulf, and probably in other parts. These three (K, G, Q) are precisely the letters as to which the native Berber words fluctuate most in orthography; in fact, the Berber, as the Persian alphabet, has five different characters to replace the two (K and G) of the Arabs: namely, so as to include the sound of the French J with the four sounds of K and G. Nevertheless, the author was disposed to believe that the French J (or *j*) has no legitimate place in a Berber book. It seems to denote a mere accidental and fugitive modification either of soft G or of Sh. It may be added, that with regard to the G-sound dialectally given to Q, which facilitates its degenerating into *Ghain*, the accuracy of the MS. cannot be safely trusted, for the two letters Ghain and Qâf (*ج* and *ق*), as written by the Berbers, are so similar in the middle of a word as to be easily mistaken. On the whole we may say, that the Berbers have no sound foreign to the Arabic. It is true, that if the soft pronunciation of G or K should appear to be significant, radical and primitive, so as to add two new consonants to the alphabet, this would be peculiar, yet not more remarkable than the notorious differences of Arabic and Hebrew in this part of their grammar. Hitherto however the evidence would incline us to believe that the soft and hard G have no radical distinction of sense, and that the soft K (or Tch), which is very rare, is, like the French J above noticed, only a dialectal variation, sometimes of Sh and sometimes of G.

The general laws of euphony, as to the formation of syllables, agree with the above. According to the strictest rule of pure Arabic two consonants cannot commence a Berber word, nor (with one or two doubtful exceptions) can *more* than two consonants anywhere come together in the same word. At the end of a word the Berber freely uses two consonants, and, compared with the *ancient* Arabic, appears hereby harsh and abrupt; but it probably is in this very point less harsh than the modern spoken Arabic. For the phænomenon is confined principally to the following cases:—(1.) feminine nouns ending in *t* or *th* impure, as *thagshishth*, a girl, from *agshish*, a boy; (2.) the termination *nt* or *nd* in the third pers. plur. of many verbs; (3.) the syncopated subjunctive of certain verbs, where a final vowel falls away.

* Our double sound of *th*, as heard in *this* and *thistle*.

On the whole, the tendency of the Berber tongue seems to be towards a softer pronunciation than is established in Arabic. The author observed the *Hh* and the *Q* of Arabic words to fall away in Berber, where they formed a harsh combination : and he had counted six words either genuine Berber or else early Arabic importations, in which the *Ain* had been obliterated ; and in fact, this letter, as also the *Hh* and *Kh*, is decidedly far rarer in true Berber words than in Arabic or Hebrew.

In regard to the doubling of the consonants, if the MS. be accepted as sufficient evidence, the Berber differs from the other two languages with which it was compared, in treating this (at least very often) as a mere matter of euphony. Much confusion in consequence arises in dealing with those Arabic words in which the duplication of a consonant modifies the sense. At the same time, even if this *never* happens with the Berbers (which the author would not assert), there can yet be no doubt that they understand and practise the peculiar dwelling of the voice on a consonant (unknown to the English, French, and Germans), in which the Arab duplication and Dagesh Forte of the Hebrews consists.

The entire vowel system of the Berbers is, at least on paper, identical with that of the Arabs. The whole MS. is carefully pointed, but the uncertainty of the vowels is in many words so great, that we must suppose either that the Arab notation is ill adapted to the Berber speech, or (what is quite as probable) that the pronunciation is very unfixed. In fact, with a different notation, nearly all the labour of the vowel-points might be saved.

§ 2. *On the Roots and their Inflexion*.—Proceeding from this general agreement in consonants and the laws of syllables, the Berber further displays a genius emphatically Syro-Arabian in the formation and inflexion of its verbal and nominal roots. It has a distinction of letters for this purpose into servile and non-servile, nearly identical with that of Hebrew and Arabic ; as also into robust and weak. The weak letters of course are W, Y, and A. I cannot positively ascertain whether A (or rather Elif-Hamza) is ever counted as a radical letter in any Berber verb ; I suspect however that the sound is wholly unknown, since the translator prefixes the Hamza to *every* word (Arabic or native) that begins with a vowel, as regularly as the Greeks their spiritus lenis. Be this as it may, at least the letters W and Y are often radical with verbs, and are then liable to become vowels, or to vanish in many of the inflexions, exactly as in the Syro-Arabian ; and yet, however long their disappearance, they never fail to come back in other derivatives. What is equally characteristic, two radical letters never so cohere as to be inseparable in a whole family. Even when they fall into juxtaposition for a while, it is felt that “ they meet but to part again.” The Gesm (or Shevâ) which is then placed between them denotes in the opinion of some, nothing ; in the opinion of others, a very short vowel, as in the English word *suddēn*. Though it may be said to unite, it as truly keeps them apart, and hence perhaps we may account for another phænomenon, distinguishing the Berber and the Syro-Arabian from

most Indo-European tongues, viz. that consonants in juxtaposition modify one another so little. Combinations such as *Ab-tu*, *Adj-tcha*, though pronounceable by us, are justly regarded as harsh; they however do not appear to offend the Berbers any more than the Arabs or Hebrews. Having been led to this point, I may add, that the tendency of N in Hebrew to become assimilated to any consonant that follows it (a tendency only very partially existing in Arabic), shows itself in a few Berber words. Thus from *Naggar*, "last," comes *Thaggara* and *Thagra*, "last state, at last," instead of *Thangara*. This however seems to be the exception in Berber, and not the rule.

As to the constitution of syllables, the Berbers appear to carry Syro-Arabian principles quite to an extreme. Syllabic arrangement is with them a mere means to pronunciation of the consonants; and, as such, is liable to be at any moment broken up and reconstructed, on a shifting of the accent. If an enclitic pronoun or particle be appended to a verb, the effect may be to introduce an entire new division of the syllables. For example, we have '*Alman*, "they knew;" *Ur-'alman*, "they knew not:" but if we add the particle *-ara*, which is equivalent to the English "ever," and often follows the negative *Ur*, as in Greek *πότε* follows *οὐ*; we get, not *Ur-'alman-ara*, but *Ur-a'limn-ara*, "they never knew," or "they knew not at all." It will be conceded that this tendency is in accordance with the Syro-Arabian genius.

Although the positive evidence offered by many Berber verbs, aided by the strong analogy of the Hebrew and Arabic, would lead us to believe that the Berber roots are generally or universally triliteral, we cannot assert this as a proved fact. A singularly large proportion of them are on a superficial view biliteral, owing, perhaps, to the suppression of a weak letter. On this matter the author had not entered into numerical reckonings; but experience had taught him, when he met with a triliteral verb, to conjecture that it might be Arabic, even if he did not know it as belonging to that language. He thought he was within the truth, in saying that for *one* full triliteral root the Berbers have *three* apparently biliteral.

§ 3. *Structure of Verbs*.—The Berber introduces into its verbs a distinction of *gender*, at least in the third person singular; exactly as do the Arabic and Hebrew. It has two principal tenses, the use of which seems to be identical with that of the (so-called) Past and Present of the other languages; and the habitual forms of its syntax are such, that there is little doubt of the possibility of translating an entire Arabic book into Berber so as to retain word for word in the same position, with tense answering to tense, by an unchanging law. The verb regularly begins a sentence; the nominative case follows, and the accusative stands last. The same phenomenon predominates, which has given rise to the doctrine of *Vau conversive* in Hebrew, and *Lam*, &c., conversive in Arabic. The author was well aware that this is regarded by excellent judges as a highly unphilosophic and even absurd doctrine; but that need not here concern us. It is enough that facts of the language exist which make this,—at least as a mechanical rule,—convenient to the

learner and plausible to the teacher, and that closely analogous facts exist in Berber. Thus *Ninna*, when isolated, must be translated, "we have said;" but should the particle *Ma*, "if" or "when," precede it, the combination gives *Maninna*, "if or when we shall say." No more words are needed to show how deeply the same feeling has worked at the basis of the Berber and of the Arab verb.

The mechanical forms are likewise to a certain extent similar, though not identical. Several dialects of Arabic have generated a new tense (besides those formed by auxiliaries), so that we have in all four uncompounded tenses, viz. the Imperative Mood, a Preterite, a Present or Aorist, and a fourth peculiarly Future. Such exactly is the case in Berber. Still more remarkable is it, that in many biliteral verbs a modification of the simplest Berber tense takes place, by dropping the final vowel, so as to produce exactly what De Sacy has named in ancient Arabic the "Syncopated Subjunctive." Again, all other recognised languages of the Syro-Arabian stock produce derivative verbs, nearly such as we call *Voices* in Greek and Latin; for instance, the Niphal, Hiphil, Pihel, &c. of the Hebrew. A similar phænomenon is discovered in Berber. Owing to the numerous sources of possible error, the author felt diffident on the question whether the passive voice is ever denoted in Berber by *mere vowel change*, as it was in ancient Arabic and is in a few still subsisting verbs; but if this could be established, it would obviate some very perplexing difficulties. Hitherto he had ascertained the following derived forms of the Berber verb:—

- (1.) Primitive: *Iphal**, he wrought.
- (2.) Causative: *Ispahhal*, he caused to work.
- (3.) Passive: *Ittapahhal*, it was wrought; and in its participle, *Addi* for *Atti*.
- (4.) ——— *Izpahhal*: perhaps an accidental variety of the 2nd.
- (5.) ——— *Ishpahhal* (if the MS. can be trusted, in a few verbs).
- (6.) ——— *Impahhal*: derived from a verbal adjective.
- (7.) ——— *Igpahhal*: (denoting, it seems) he wrought thoroughly.

That which is here registered as the 3rd form is closely similar in its structure to the 5th of the Arabic, while its meaning is as in Gheez; for there the passive is produced by prefixing *ta* to the root. The 2nd form, which prefixes *Is*, deserves remark, as presenting a correspondence with the spoken language of Southern Arabia, according to the information of Mr. F. Fresnel. This appears only from Gesenius's paper on the Himyarite Language, in which it is not stated what is the *meaning* of that form. That which is placed 6th is opposed to Syro-Arabian analogies; but there seems to be positive evidence of the fact. Another coincidence not to be overlooked is, that the Berber produces what in Hebrew and Arabic are called *Mimmated* verbals: as, from *Aksaw*,

* This verb is invented, to conform with the received method of denoting the derived forms in Hebrew.

“carpere, colligere, pasci,” comes *Maksaw*, “pastor;” from *Ilul*, “natus est,” *Milul*, “partus,” *Mithlul*, “natalia.” Nouns of action or Gerunds are also derived from the verbs, and appear (as far as they have been met with) to be as irregular as in Arabic; but it is not wonderful that they are not frequent, since in the spoken Arabic they seem to be undergoing the same gradual extinction as the Infinitive Mood has suffered in Greek.

The Berber participle active not only is unlike to Hebrew or Arabic in form, but has even a European aspect, as it ends in *an* and sometimes *ant*. Its use however is thoroughly Syro-Arabian, since it habitually supplies the place of a Present Tense in all three persons, the words *Am*, *Art*, *Is*, &c. being, as would appear, *understood*.

§ 4. *Pronouns*.—In the first personal pronoun, and in the suffix for the second person, there is a close relation between Berber and the Syro-Arabian tongues; and it is worth while also to compare the Coptic:—

	I	We	Thee	You
Hebrew.	Anoki	Anahhnu	k	kem, ken.
Arabic.	Ana	Nahhni	k	kum, kun.
Berber.	Nakki	{ Nakni (suffix) nagh (prefix) agh }	k	kun.
Coptic.	{ Anok Anogh }	Anon	k	ten.

A glance at the first column will show that the Berber pronoun has not been introduced from the Arabic. With such a similarity in the pronouns, it need not surprise us that the personal endings of the verbs are very similar to those of the Syro-Arabian; but it is remarkable that the chief exception is in the first person singular, which ends in *igh*, a termination, beyond a doubt, coming from the *k* of *Nakki*, which, in another dialect, must have been sounded *Naghi*. Here also we learn from Gesenius (*Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, July 1841, p. 371), that the final *k* performs the same purpose in the Himyarite language, in the Gheez, in the Maltese, and in the later Samaritan.

As to the *third* person of the verb, the author was not disposed to believe that in Arabic or Hebrew the inflexions have anything to do with pronouns at all. It was sufficient to say that in both genders of the singular it is identical with Arabic and Hebrew, while in the plural it agrees with the ancient but not with the modern Arabic. The third personal pronoun of the Berbers is,—*Natta*, he, ille; *Nattath*, she, illa; pl. *Nuthni*, they, illi, illæ, illa. The similarity of these to the Coptic, though not very close, is too close, we may conclude, to be accidental. We there find—

Nëthof, he; *Nëthos*, she; *Nëthóú*, they.

A point of some interest, as assimilating the Berber to the Coptic, and contrasting it with the Arabic and Hebrew, is found in its taking affix or infix pronouns *before* the root of the verb as well as after. This may be looked on as an African peculiarity, according

to a remark of Dr. J. Cowles Prichard, that the African languages are prone to inflexions at the beginning of words. Hazardous as it is to lay down a law on the subject, the author would venture the remark, that the *principal* verb of a Berber sentence takes its dependent pronoun *suffixed*, while a *secondary* verb in a dependent clause has its pronoun as a *prefix*. One example will suffice :—

Winna akkun-irzan, irzan-i; winna ay-irzan, natta
Is-qui vos-accipiens, accipiens-me; is-qui me-accipiens, ille
irza winna ayidd-ashay'an
accepit eum-qui me mittens.

This may remind us of a well-known rule of German syntax.

Even adverbs in Berber occasionally take suffix pronouns after them. One such instance is in striking analogy to Arabic idiom, viz. the particle *Agla*, which is employed principally to mark the apodosis of a sentence (nearly as *Lo!* in antique English), and annexes to itself in a suffix form the pronoun which is needed as nominative case to the following verb. This is a perfect counterpart to the use of *Enna* in Arabic.

The relative pronouns and their adverbial derivatives present several points of coincidence with the Syro-Arabian; but the only thing that deserves to be made here prominent is, that the same in-artificial and rather clumsy substitute is employed as in Hebrew, &c. for a true declinable relative; just as though in Latin, instead of saying, *Is, quem Deus misit*, we were to express ourselves, *Is, quod Deus misit eum*. At the same time, the Berbers have two different words, each uniting the idea of antecedent and relative *is-qui, ea-quæ, id-quod*, &c., so as often to give much clearness and conciseness to the phraseology. This has a close correspondence with the Coptic.

§ 5. *Nouns*.—Berber substantives have a distinction of gender into masculine and feminine, but no neuter; and the feminine is generally denoted by the termination *t* or *th*. This is Syro-Arabian. The *th* also often precedes, as in *Thagshishth*, “a girl;” *Thamdint*, “a city;” *Thabhhirth*, “a lake;” *Thamshahuth*, “a parable.” It is stated in the Penny Cyclopædia (article Berbers) that the initial *Th* is the definite article, but there are many difficulties attending such a supposition. If however it be so, it would seem to be the *feminine* definite article, as in Coptic; for it does not appear to attach itself to all nouns, but, as I think, to the feminine ones only, and to some of these it seems to be inseparably united. At the same time, the Berbers appear to have gratuitously incorporated the Arab article *El* (or *L*) with many nouns, and it is conceivable that a like corruption of their native article may have taken place. Masculine nouns appear to take *W* at the beginning nearly *ad libitum*; as *Agshish* or *Wagshish*, a boy; but never *Thagshish*. It may be worth remarking, that in the Amharic language the definite article is *O*, which is looked on as a degenerate pronunciation of *El*. In the Berber there are occasional indications that *W* and *U* have the same power; but this must be left for

further inquiry, especially as the initial U (written *ou*) is in Coptic the indefinite article.

Very characteristic of the Syro-Arabian genius is the use of nouns *in regimen* to make up for the want of a genitive case. The same thing exists occasionally in Berber, even with native nouns; although, since (just as in Chaldee and most dialects of modern Arabic) a particle has been produced equivalent to the English *of*, the Berbers are not obliged to resort to this method. What may deserve remark, the MS. often uses a redundant suffix pronoun (which is a Turkish* idiom) to point out which noun is in the genitive case; saying "Brother *of him*, Peter," instead of "Brother *of* Peter." In two marked instances, namely *Baba*, "father," and *Yamma*, "mother," the forms of the nouns before a suffix pronoun alter into *Babath* and *Yammath*. These, however, are exceptive cases, and point rather to a past than a present state of the language.

The syllable *Edh*, or single consonant *Dh*, is perpetually attaching itself to the beginning of Berber nouns, with a close analogy to the Hebrew *Eth* and *Oth*, popularly called the sign of the accusative. This indeed occurs so often as to vitiate the use of vocabularies, if it be not carefully rejected from the beginning.

§ 6. *Remark on the Vocables of Berber.*—A large portion of Arabic has naturally been introduced into the Berber. Indications nevertheless appear, that many words which are common to the two languages are not importations, but a part of the native stock. In illustration of this we may quote the following examples, in which the Berber approximates rather more to the Hebrew than to the Arabic:—

Arabic.	Berber.	Hebrew.
<i>Qari</i> , to read.	<i>Qara</i> , to call, &c.	<i>Qara</i> , to call, &c.
<i>Qadas</i> , to be holy.	<i>Qadash</i> , to minister in holy things.	<i>Qadash</i> , to be holy.
<i>Zid</i> , to be excessive, or in surplus.	<i>Zid</i> , to sin.	<i>Zid</i> , to sin boldly.
<i>Ghazh</i> (غاض), to be enraged.	<i>Laghtat</i> (لغطت), rage.	<i>Ghit</i> or <i>'It</i> (ע'יט), to be enraged.
<i>Hharath</i> , to meditate.	<i>Hharash</i> , to be wise or circumspect.	<i>Hharash</i> , to medi- tate.
<i>Sùg</i> , market, street.	<i>Shùg</i> , ditto.	<i>Shùg</i> , ditto.
<i>Zhill</i> (ظل), shade.	<i>Thili</i> , ditto.	<i>Ssill</i> (צל), ditto.

It must at the same time be added, that various words which were at first supposed to be genuine Berber, have since been recognised as corrupted Arabic; and in the course of a thousand years many successive importations may have taken place, which are now greatly disguised.

On these grounds the author rested the claim of the Berber to be regarded as a sister-tongue to those of which the Hebrew is the

* Only that in Turkish the order is reversed; as "*Petri, frater ejus*," for "*Pètri frater*."

oldest literary type. It may be added however as remarkable, that the native Berber *numerals* are totally alien to those of Hebrew and Arabic. Of these numerals only the first is found in the Berber MS. of the four Gospels, all the rest being borrowed from the Arabic; but the Shiluah dialect of the Berber, spoken further in the interior, retains an entire and distinct set of numerals, which, there can be no doubt, are the true Mauritanian roots.

On the reading of this paper a discussion arose on the question, whether the Berber of Algiers was not so corrupted with Arabic as to afford a very unsafe means of testing the peculiarities of the Berber language generally. But it was observed, that Mr. Hodgson* had arrived at conclusions in some respects resembling those of Mr. Newman, from an extensive examination of the Berber dialects; and it was also stated that the Rev. R. C. Renouard, who had paid particular attention to the study of these dialects, considered the Berber language as one of decidedly Shemitic character†.

2. "On the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands."—*(Continued.)* By the Rev. R. Garnett.

The remarks already made on the Celtic languages have been made partly with the view of stating some of the apparent grounds for considering them as branches of that great family of tongues which has spread itself from Central Asia to the extreme west of Europe. One of the latest writers on the subject, Mr. Johnes, though he regards Asia as the cradle of the race, thinks it probable that the Celts did not, as is commonly supposed, pass by the Euxine and the Danube in their progress westward, but by Syria and Africa into Spain, and afterwards into Gaul. The serious objections to this hypothesis are:—1. There is no mention whatever in ancient history of Celts either in Syria, Egypt, or Mauritania. 2. Ancient writers uniformly represent the Celts as intruders from the *eastward* upon the Iberians. 3. There is no positive trace of Celticism in any known African language; while every Indo-European dialect, from Hindostan to Portugal, shows unequivocal proofs either of admixture with Celtic elements or of a community of origin, and not unfrequently of both. In the Romance languages, and some of the Germanic dialects, this phænomenon may be easily explained on historical and geographical data; but there are languages extensively prevalent, spoken by tribes remote, as far as we know, from all direct Celtic influence, that nevertheless exhibit many remarkable correspondences with that class of tongues, some of which are apparently too close to be explained by a remote collateral affinity. It will be sufficient to give a few select instances from the Armenian and the Slavonic, both of which differ as strongly from Celtic in

* Trans. of the Amer. Phil. Soc. Philadelphia, vol. iv. New Series, 1834.

† In the course of the evening it was mentioned that a vocabulary of Berber words might be found in Host's Account of Morocco, translated from the Danish into German, A.D. 1781; and a vocabulary of Si'wah words in Minutoli's Travels to this Oasis. Venture's Vocabulary, already alluded to, was appended to Langlès' Translation of Horneman's Travels, but no copy of this translation has been found in the London libraries.

their organization and general characteristics as any members of the Indo-European family differ from each other :—

ARMENIAN.

CELTIC.

dsiern.....	<i>hand</i>	G*.& W. dour̄n, dorn, <i>fist</i> .
khuir	<i>sister</i>	W. chwaer.
djur	<i>water</i>	W. dwr.
ardj.....	<i>bear</i>	W. arth.
dzarr	<i>tree</i>	— derw, <i>oak</i> .
mis	<i>flesh</i>	— mes, <i>dish, meal</i> .
datel	<i>to judge</i>	— dadlen, <i>to litigate</i> .
bari.....	<i>good</i>	Bret. brao ; G. breagh.
Pag-anel...	<i>to salute</i>	W. G. pog, <i>a kiss</i> .
tun	<i>house</i>	G. dun, <i>a fort</i> ; W. din.
phait	<i>wood</i>	G. fiadh ; W. gwydd.
am	<i>year</i>	G. W. am, <i>time</i> .
oskr	<i>bone</i>	W. asgwrn.
gloukh ...	<i>head</i>	W. clog, in pen-glog ; G. cloghan, <i>skull</i> .
sir	<i>love</i>	W. G. serch.
air	<i>man</i>	G. fear ; W. gwr.
amis	<i>month</i>	W. mis.
lousin.....	<i>moon</i>	— lloer.
khoz	<i>swine</i>	— hwch.
arjat	<i>silver</i>	G. airgiod.
amarn.....	<i>summer</i>	— samhradh.
boun	<i>trunk, stock</i> .	W. bon ; G. buñ.
I werah ...	<i>over, upon</i> ...	— gwor, gor ; G. for.
kin	<i>woman</i>	G. coinne.
ter, <i>lord</i> ; <i>gen.</i>	<i>tearan</i> ...	W. teyrn.
khagzr ...	<i>sweet</i>	— chweg.
ail	<i>but</i>	G. ail, <i>other</i> . (Cf. Gr. ἀλλὰ.)

The coincidences with the Slavonic dialects are much too numerous to be here given at length. In the following list an attempt is made to point out some of the most remarkable :—

SLAVONIC.

CELTIC.

baba	<i>an old woman</i>	Ir. badhbh, <i>sorceress</i> .
blag	<i>good</i>	— breagh ; Bret. brav.
blesk	<i>brightness</i>	— blosg, <i>light</i> .
blejat (Rus.)	<i>to bleat</i>	W. bloeddiaw, <i>to ery out</i> .
blato.....	<i>mud</i>	— llaid.
bodat (Rus.)	{ <i>to prick, to butt with</i> <i>the horns</i>	— pwtiaw, <i>to butt, poke</i> .
borju.....	<i>I fight</i>	Ir. bor, <i>victory</i> ; borras, <i>soldier</i> .
bran	<i>battle</i>	— braine, <i>captain, chief</i> .
briju	<i>I shave</i>	W. byrrau <i>to crop</i> .
† Br'z	<i>quick</i>	— pres ; Ir. brise ; E. <i>brisk</i> .
briag	<i>bank, shore</i>	G. braighe ; W. bre, <i>high ground</i> ; Sc. brae.
vitaz	<i>conqueror</i>	W. buddyg
vlaga.....	<i>moisture</i>	— gwlych ; Ir. fliuch.
vladuika ...	<i>ruler</i>	— gwledig ; Ir. flaith.
vlas	<i>hair</i>	— gwallt ; Ir. folt.
vl'k	<i>wolf</i>	Ir. breach.
vl'na	<i>wool</i>	W. gwlan ; Ir. ollan.
vran	<i>raven, black</i>	Ir. bran. <i>raven, black</i> ; W. bran, <i>raven</i> .
vriema, <i>gen.</i>	<i>vriemene, time</i>	Bret. breman, <i>now</i> .
varit (Rus.)	<i>to boil</i>	W. berwi.
voz	<i>upwards</i> ; <i>vuisok, high</i>	Ir. uas, <i>up</i> ; uasal, <i>high, noble</i> .
v'rt	<i>garden</i>	— gort.

* G. Gaelic ; W. Welsh ; Bret. Breton.

† The medial comma represents the hard jerr. A soft jerr is denoted by (i).

SLAVONIC.			CELTIC.	
viera.....	<i>faith</i>	W.	gwir ; Ir. <i>flor, true.</i>	
glava	<i>head</i>	—	pen-glog ; Ir. <i>clogan, skull.</i>	
glas	<i>voice</i>	W.	llais.	
gor'kui.....	<i>bitter</i>	Ir.	geur, <i>sour, sharp.</i>	
grom	<i>thunder</i>	Bret.	kurun (<i>κεραυνός</i>).	
debel	<i>thick</i>	W.	tew.	
dlanĭ	<i>palm of the hand</i> ...	W. G.	dourn.	
dl'g	<i>debt</i>	Ir.	dlighe ; W. <i>dyled.</i>	
dol	<i>valley</i>	W.	dol.	
drozd, drozg	<i>thrush</i>	—	tresglen.	
dĭbrĭ.....	<i>valley</i>	—	dyffryn.	
zima.....	<i>winter</i>	—	gauav, <i>anciently gaem.</i>	
kash'ŭ	<i>cough</i>	G.	cas ; W. <i>pas.</i>	
kobuila.....	<i>mare</i>	—	capull ; W. <i>keffyl, horse.</i>	
kolieno.....	<i>knee</i>	—	glun ; W. <i>glin.</i>	
kovatz	<i>smith</i>	W.	gov.	
kradu	<i>I steal</i>	G.	creachaim.	
kr'vĭ.....	<i>blood</i>	W.	crau. (Lat. <i>cruor</i>).	
krag(Polish)	<i>circle</i>	—	crwn, <i>round.</i>	
liek	<i>medicine</i>	Ir.	leigheachd.	
lag	<i>grove</i>	W.	llwyn (Rom. <i>λόγγος</i>).	
mal	<i>little</i>	—	mal, <i>small, light.</i>	
minu.....	<i>I pass</i>	—	myned, <i>to go.</i>	
ml'zu	<i>I milk</i>	Ir.	blighim.	
more.....	<i>sea</i>	W. G.	mor.	
mas	<i>flesh</i>	W.	mes, <i>a meal</i> ; E. <i>mess.</i>	
rad	<i>willing</i>	—	rhad, <i>free, gratuitous.</i>	
panĭ (Illyr.)	<i>trunk of a tree</i>	—	bon ; Ir. <i>bun.</i>	
rouno	<i>fleece</i>	W.	rhawn ; Ir. <i>ron, hair of animals.</i>	
salo	<i>fat</i>	Ir.	saill.	
slob	<i>weak, infirm</i>	W.	clov.	
slava.....	<i>glory</i>	Ir.	cliu (Gr. <i>κλέος</i>).	
slug	<i>servant</i>	—	sgolog (Ger. <i>schalk</i>).	
slied.....	<i>footstep</i>	—	sliocht (E. <i>slot</i>).	
snieg.	<i>snow</i>	—	sneacht.	
soloma(Rus.)	<i>straw</i>	W.	calav.	
son (Russ.)	<i>sleep</i>	G.	suain.	
such	<i>dry</i>	W.	sych.	
srzde	<i>heart</i>	G.	cridhe.	
srieda	<i>middle</i>	W.	craidd.	
tuin	<i>hedge</i>	G.	dun, <i>fort.</i>	
cherv	<i>worm</i>	—	crumh.	
shirok	<i>broad</i>	—	sir, <i>long.</i>	
shui	<i>left, sinister</i>	W.	aswy.	

Many of the above terms have undoubtedly only a collateral affinity, as they co-exist in Sanscrit and other languages ; but others are, as far as is at present known, peculiar to Celtic and Slavonic, and exhibit an absolute identity of form and meaning such as we should hardly expect, *à priori*, to find in languages so remote from each other. Among the former class may be noticed the root *cas* (cough), as a good example of the agreement as well as of the difference of the various members of the great Indo-European family of tongues. The Sanscrit *kās*, Gaelic *cas*, Lithuanian *kosulys*, a cough, *kostu*, I cough, and Slavonic *kusheli*, exhibit the guttural initial ; the German *husten*, Lowland Scotch *host*, Armenian *huz*, the aspirate ; the Welsh and Armoric *pās*, and Greek *βήξ*, the labial ; and the Latin *tussis*, the dental. The Kurdish *goka* bears a singular resemblance, not only to the upper German *kauchen* and the En-

glish *cough*, but also to several Finnish dialects; Finnish proper, *köhkä*, *kökhä*; Esthonian *köhhä*; Hungarian *köhe*; Lappish *kossas*. We may here remark, by the way, that this and a variety of similar instances would lead one to suspect that the Finnish and commonly so-called Indo-European languages may be more nearly related to each other than the generality of philologists seem willing to allow. Another word, appearing in both lists; Armenian *tun*, house, Slavonic *tuin*, a hedge, is deserving of notice for its probable identity, not only with the Celtic *dun*, *din*, but also with the German *zaun*, a hedge; Anglo-Saxon *tun*, a hamlet; and lowland Scotch *town*, a homestead. The radical idea is that of *inclosure*, as is proved by the primary verbs; Anglo-Saxon *tynan* (still extant in the Lancashire *tyne*, to shut), and Irish *dunaim*, I shut, inclose, barricade. Another remarkable word is—Russian *son*, Gaelic *suain*, sleep. Though these words are undoubtedly cognate with the Sanscrit *swapna*, it is worthy of notice that they agree closely in *form* with the Pracrit *sunā*, produced, agreeably to the genius of that dialect, by the elision of the medial consonants. The Greek and Welsh have *duplicate* forms: Gr. *ὑπνος*, W. *hep*, from *swapna*; and Gr. *εὕνη*, W. *hun*, from *sunā*. A similar phænomenon may be observed in the Pali and Pracrit *pati*, Doric *ποτι*, Armenian *pat*; compared with Sanscr. *prati*, Ionic *πρότι*, ordinary Hellenic *πρός*. It is possible that a careful analysis of Pali and Pracrit forms, for which there are unfortunately few facilities at present, might lead to the discovery of analogies between Sanscrit and the languages of Europe which have not hitherto been suspected.

The extensive affinities of *worm*, which is found in one form or other in nearly all languages of the class, have been repeatedly noticed by German philologists as examples of the interchange of the guttural initial (Sanskrit *krimi*, Lithunian *krimis*) with the palatal (Slavonic *cherv*) and the labial (Latin *vermis*, Engl. *worm*, Welsh *pryv*). They appear to have overlooked our *grub*, which has a decidedly Celtic aspect, and, rather an unusual phænomenon in English words, agrees more closely with the Gaelic form *crumh* than the Welsh *pryv*. This however does not prove it to be adopted from the Gaelic, since, though the Welsh prefers the labial form to the guttural, it has in many cases duplicate forms, e. g. *crys* and *pres*, haste. *Cruv* may therefore have existed in the Lloegrian British though not now found in Welsh.

With respect to the second class of terms, namely those apparently peculiar to Slavonic and Celtic, the resemblance of such terms as *vran* and *bran*, raven; *kovatz* and *gof*, smith; *vladuika* and *gwledig*, chief, illustrious; is too obvious to be here insisted on. It is difficult to say how far they may or may not be *borrowed*, as we have scarcely any data for ascertaining the ancient juxtaposition or absolute separation of the tribes. Tacitus informs us that the language of the *Æstii** approximated to that of the Britons. If that were really the case, it might be conjectured that there is at least one relic of their speech in the Lithuanian *merga*, maiden (Welsh *merch*),

* The name of *Æstii* may have been given to some of the neighbouring tribes, as well as to the Finnish race, which is represented by the modern Ests.

a term which has not a little puzzled the native etymologists. Generally speaking, however, the Lithuanian and Lettish languages show fewer correspondences with Celtic than are found in the ecclesiastical dialect, or ancient Slavonic. This, there is reason to believe, was the language of the Pannonian provinces, where it is possible those who spoke it might have more or less intercourse with Celtic tribes.

A remarkable word found in all the Slavonic dialects, but admitting of no etymological explanation within their limits, is *bolvan*, an idol or statue. Pott, in his 'Dissertation on the Lithuanian Language,' after giving the forms of it in the different dialects, adds—"Mihi etymon vocis ignotum." Grimm also points it out as a very peculiar word in the last edition of the 'Deutsche Mythologie,' without attempting to account for it. An etymology, appearing at least plausible, is furnished by the Armorican *peulvan*, of which Pelletier gives the following account in his 'Dictionnaire de la Langue Bretonne':—"PEULVAN: a long stone, erected perpendicularly in the form of a pillar or post; a rough unwrought column. This word is current in Basse Cornouaille, towards Audierne, where several of those stones occur on the high roads and in waste places. It is a compound of *peul*—post or pillar—and *man*, figure, personage, appearance; signifying perhaps the appearance of a man standing upright; the form of the first plural (*peulvanet*) denoting beings that are animated, or reputed to be so. May not our ancestors have placed those stones as objects of some sort of worship or religious ceremony, and as a kind of idol?" The idea that those monuments were objects of religious reverence in the Druidical times is generally adopted by the antiquaries of Britany, and it is stated that the peasantry have still some vague superstitions respecting them. We may here remark, that the Wallachian *balavanu*, evidently the same as the Slavonic word, simply means a large stone, thereby approximating more to the Celtic *peulvan* in material import. If we admit the identity of the terms, it would follow that the Slavonians have been the borrowers in this instance, the component parts of the word being significant in Celtic but not in Slavonic; nor, it is believed, in any other Indo-European language. This might lead to an interesting inquiry whether, and to what extent, the mythologies of the two races appear to be connected. The setting-up a pillar of stone or wood as a rude symbol of some deity appears to have been a practice almost universal with pagan nations.

The occurrence of Celtic words in the Albanian language may be easily accounted for, as we know that Celtic tribes were intermixed with the Thracians as late as the time of Trajan. One of the most remarkable coincidences is the term for *egg*: Albanian *βελ* (pronounced *vi*), Cymric *wy*. Here again the Gaelic *ubh* is more remote, though it accords very well with the Latin *ovum* and Greek *ὄν* (*Æolic* *ὠFόν*). *Groua*, woman, may be referred either to the Gaelic *gruag* or Welsh *gwraig*. *Dovre*, hand, is more analogous to the Welsh or Gaelic *dourn* than to the Slavonic *dlani*. Most of the words common to Celtic and Albanian are however identical with those already pointed out in the Slavonic dialects, and may have been introduced from that quarter.

Several members of the Society having expressed a wish that notice should be given of the subjects to be discussed on particular evenings, the Council have ordered it to be announced, that on Friday, December the 8th, the following papers will be read :

1. "On the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands" (continued). By the Rev. R. Garnett.
2. "On English Pronouns Indeterminate." By E. Guest, Esq.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

DECEMBER 8, 1843.

No. 14.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP of LLANDAFF in the Chair.

Professors Herman, Lassen, and W. K. Grimm were elected honorary Members of the Society.

The following communications were then read:—

1. “On a Greek Inscription lately found in Corfu.” By the Rev. Dr. Hawtrey.

The inscription, of which a fac-simile is here given, was found on a broken tomb near the site of ancient Corcyra, in the month of October 1843. It was received from Corfu about five weeks since. It is not difficult to collect from the words the following history:

Tlasias, the father of Menecrates, in whose honour the monument was inscribed, was a native of Æanthe, a town of the Locri Ozolæ. That tribe was one of the most uncivilized in Greece, even so late as the Peloponnesian war. Thucydides, in that short and lucid sketch which he has prefixed to his History, after speaking of the islanders in general as pirates, and as not ashamed of their predatory lives, but as rather proud of them, adds this—καὶ μέχρι τοῦδε πολλὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τῷ παλαιῷ τρόπῳ νέμεται, περί τε Λοκροῦς τοὺς Ὀζόλας . . . καὶ τὴν ταύτην ἡπειρὸν τό τε σιδηροφορεῖσθαι τοῦτοις τοῖς ἡπειρώταις ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς ληστείας ἐμμεμένηκε. They probably differed little from the modern Κλέφτες, and their country may have been as unsafe for strangers as the Albanian and Mainote mountains are at the present day,

Tlasias however seems to have been the father of two sons, who had inherited or learned more peaceful habits. Even in this wild country the beneficial institution of *private προξενία* (for we can hardly suppose that any *public* regulation yet existed) had been established, and Menecrates had become the πρόξενος of the mercantile people of Corcyra. This colony of Corinth maintained the habits and rivalled the wealth of its metropolis, and though Dorian in race, had the enterprising character of Ionians. To obtain native protection in every port to which commerce might direct the ships of Corcyra, must have been very desirable, and among a race of pirates and robbers peculiarly so. It is probable that in the relation of πρόξενος Menecrates often defended the Corcyrean merchants from the injuries of his rude countrymen, and it is natural that he should occasionally visit, perhaps as a merchant, the people on whose gratitude he had a claim. It seems that in one of these voyages he was drowned, but that his body was carried to the shore of Corcyra.

The friendship of the δῆμος, who were always the most powerful party in the maritime nations of Greece, honoured their benefactor

with a public funeral and a marble monument. His brother Praximenes may possibly have been saved from the storm, in which Menecrates perished; at all events he arrived in time to join with the Corcyreans in paying the last honours to his brother, and in commemorating their joint act by the verses which were inscribed on the tomb. The verses in more modern letters are as follows: the lacunæ are filled up from conjecture in smaller letters.

◇ ΗΥΙΟΥ ΤΛΑΣΙΑΦΟ ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΕΟΣ ΤΟΔΕ ΣΑΜΑ,
ΟΙΑΝΘΕΟΣ ΓΕΝΕΑΝ· ΤΟΔΕ Δ ΑΥΤΟΙ ΔΑΜΟΣ ΕΠΟΙΕΙ·
ΕΣ ΓΑΡ ΠΡΟΞΕΝΦΟΣ ΔΑΜΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΣ· ΑΛΛ ΕΝΙ ΠΟΝΤΟΙ
ΟΛΕΤΟ· ΔΑΜΟΣΙΟΝ ΔΕ ΚΑΘ^{ικ}ΕΤΟ πένθος ἕκαστον·
ΠΡΑΞΙΜΕΝΕΣ Δ ΑΥΤΟΣ γάλας ΑΠΟ ΠΑΤΡΙΔΟΣ ΕΝΘΟΝ
ΣΥΝ ΔΑΜΟΙ ΤΟΔΕ ΣΑΜΑ ΚΑΣΙΓΝΕΤΟΙΟ ΠΟΝΕΘΕ.

On this inscription it may be remarked:—

1. That the form of the characters, compared with that of other early letters, seems to belong to a period as early as that of Pisistratus.

2. That the choice of heroic rather than elegiac verse is also a mark of antiquity.

3. That, though early, it is not among the *earliest* inscriptions, because it possesses the letters Θ, Ξ, and Φ, which are expressed respectively by two characters in the following inscription on a column. It is the third in Boeckh's Collection:—

ΠΑΙ ΔΙΟΣ ΕΚΠΗΑΝΤΟΙ ΔΕΚΣΑΙ ΤΟΔ ΑΜΕΝΠΗΕΣ
ΑΓΑΛΜΑ·
ΣΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΠΕΥΚΗΟΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΟΥΤ ΕΤΕΛΕΣΣΕ
ΤΡΟΠΗΟΝ.

[Boeckh would read ΓΡΟΦΩΝ, as a harsh Dorism for ΓΡΑΦΩΝ, "the sculptor;" it is perhaps better to consider Τρόφω the name of the artist, and Ἐκφάντος the name of the dedicator. The form of the first letter, in the inscription, has more the likeness of a broken T than of a Γ.]

4. That this inscription is read *throughout* from right to left, not βουστροφηδόν. I believe this to be very unusual.

5. That we find in this inscription a complete alphabet, with the exception of B, Z, X, Ψ, which letters happen not to be wanted in any of the words. O, E, serve for both vowel sounds of the respective letters, and Η has its original power as an aspirate.

6. That there is something very singular in the use of the digamma, indicating a period in which the letter was passing into desuetude, and rather carelessly employed. It does not take the place of Υ in αὐτός. The word Οϊανθέος, genitive of Οϊανθεὺς, which probably was originally written Οϊανθῆς Οϊανθέως, is in this inscription read as a trisyllable. I believe that no instance can be found in the Homeric poems of such a contraction. Again, the penultima of πρόξενος is lengthened, not as we find in Ionic, Doric, and Attic poets by the insertion of ι after ε, or by adding the F in the same place, but by introducing the F after ν. Now this is altogether dif-

ferent from all usage of that letter as hitherto found. It has generally been considered as a radical letter, which after a time indeed was lost to the language, but which, in no age, was inserted *ad libitum*. In this word, had the letter preceded the ν , all would have been plain: $\pi\rho\acute{o}\xi\epsilon\text{F}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ would have had its penultima common, as the vowel precedes a mute and a liquid. The letter would never have interfered with the quantity; whereas its present place in $\pi\rho\acute{o}\xi\epsilon\nu\text{F}\omicron\varsigma$ would have made the ϵ necessarily long, and the letter could not have remained there, if the word were used, as it commonly must have been, for a dactyl.

7. That the ι in $\text{T}\lambda\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ is lengthened arbitrarily. $\text{T}\lambda\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, were the dialect not Doric, would have been $\text{T}\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ from $\tau\lambda\acute{\alpha}\omega$, as $\text{K}\tau\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ from $\kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$ *; but in neither word could the ι have been lengthened, unless $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\sigma\epsilon\iota$, whereas here the syllable is $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$.

8. The aoristus passive $\pi\omicron\nu\acute{\eta}\theta\eta$ is used for the aoristus middle $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\nu\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$. I can neither find nor recollect any instance of a similar usage. In every other part of the inscription the Doric change of η into α is observed, but here we have $\pi\omicron\nu\acute{\eta}\theta\eta$ for $\pi\omicron\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta$. One might almost be tempted to believe that the workman employed to cut the letters spoke a different dialect from that in which the verses are composed. The Doric genitive, $-\omega$ for $-\omicron\nu$, is not used in this inscription.

2. "On English Pronouns Indeterminate," by Edwin Guest, Esq.

In Anglo-Saxon the word *man* often takes the place of a pronoun indeterminate, as *man geaf him* they gave to him, *man mihte geseeno* one might see, &c. In the Old-English the use of the plural noun seems to have superseded that of the singular, and we meet with such phrases as *men it herd* they heard it, *men sais* they say, where *sais* represents the plural of the northern conjugation. At the beginning of the twelfth century another pronoun indeterminate made its appearance, which has left very marked traces behind it in our literature. The Old-English *me* was used in the same constructions, and for the same purposes as the Anglo-Saxon *man*, and some philologists would not scruple to term the one a mere corruption of the other. But there are no questions in philology more difficult than those which relate to the *n*-letter, and the inquiry could only end by involving us in all the perplexities of the mysterious *Nunnation*. Perhaps we may more safely consider this pronoun as the second element of the Latin *ne-mo* and *ho-mo*, and consequently also of the Anglo-Saxon *gu-ma* a man, which of course must be identical with *ho-mo*. From which of our spoken dialects it worked its way into our written language does not very clearly appear, but as it was known to the Low-Dutch, and is earliest found in our Southern MSS., the probability is that it came from one of our Southern dialects.

1. "Nu *me* þe bringæð þer ðu beon sceatt."

Now man thee bringeth, where thou shalt bide.—*The Grave*.

* Of course it is not meant to speak of these as verbal forms in use, but merely as those from which the respective futures are etymologically deduced.

2. "Dises geares *me* began ærost to weorcenne on þan niwan mynstre on Ceortesæge."
This year they began first to work on the new Minster in Chertsey.—*S. Chron. A.D. 1110.*
 3. "First lord he was in Engolond, of whom *me* spekiþ 3et."
R. Glou. 11.
 4. "Wo so were of take mýd hert oper mýd hýnde
Me ssolde smýte of hys heuede, 3ýf *me* mýzte hým fýnde."
R. Glou. 414.
 5. "Plenty *me* may in Engelond of alle gode y se."
R. Glou. 1.
 6. "The kyng asked drynk of that present—
Me brouhte hit him in a coppe of gold,
The kyng therof drank, that he ne schold."—*K. Alis. 7857.*
 7. "Ne *me* teendeth not a lanterne and putteth it undir a bushel but on a candelstick," &c.—*Wiclif, Matt. 5.*
 8. "Thou that prehist that *me* schal not stele, stelist—thou that techist that *me* schall not do lecherie, doist lecherie."—*Wiclif, Rom. 2.*
 9. "The emperour tho het in haste
Me schold here into prison kaste."—*Och. Imp. 218.*
 10. "*Me* levede noght that sche seide."—*Ib. 230.*
- In place of this indeterminate pronoun, the Friesish has two forms, *min* and *me*, the latter of which seems to be always used as a suffix * to the verb, as *momme* one may, *somme* one should, &c. These phrases are seldom, if ever, made use of by modern Friesish writers, though found in almost every page of the old poet Gysbert Japicx.
11. "Sjogh dy greate maesters holle
Momme uwt socken kraeg naet sjean
In dear efter him dy dolle
Iz troghackle' oer al sijn klean."
See the great masters noll !
Out of such a ruff one may not see—
And there after him the fool,
Is beslash'd o'er all his clothes.—*Jolle in Haytse-jem.*
 12. "Gietme den ford ijnne tjercke ?
Nee : mar aerne to jier-mercke."
Gee they then forrad to the kirk ?
Nay ! but somewhere to the fair.—*Ib.*
 13. "In hier *sjochtme* dat de hijmmel yeu besondere foarsorge oere minschen het."

* In old Dutch writers, however, and also (it is believed) in the present boor-speech of Holland, we occasionally find this pronoun used precisely as in Old-English, *dewijl m' ons zeide*, because they told us, &c.

And here one sees that Heaven shows a wonderful watchfulness o'er men.—*Dorilis in Cleonice*.

The same construction was occasionally used in our own language.

14. "Right story *can me* not ken, þe certeynte what spellis."
Rob. Br. 25.

and it no doubt gave rise to those curious idioms which are noticed by Pegge in his 'Anecdotes of the Engl. Lang.,' p. 217. This writer, whose evidence to a *fact* we may avail ourselves of, whatever we think of his criticism or his scholarship, quotes the following as forms of speech then prevalent among the Londoners:—"and so *says me I*," "well what *does me I*," "so *says me she*," "then away *goes me he*," "what *does me they*," &c. Here it is obvious that *me* is the indeterminate pronoun, and represents the *subject*, while the personal pronoun is put in apposition to it, so that "*says me I*" is equivalent to *one says, that is I*. These idioms are not unknown to our literature.

15. "But as he was by diverse principall young gentlemen, to his no small glorie, lifted up on horseback, *comes me a page* of Amphialus, who with humble smiling reverence delivered a letter unto him from Clinias."—*Pembr. Arcad. B. iii.*

Other idioms, which have generally been confounded with those last mentioned, have the indeterminate pronoun preceded by a nominative absolute—that curious form, which plays so important a part in English grammar, and which has been so generally overlooked by our grammarians.

16. "*I*, having been acquainted with the smell before, knew it was Crab, and—*goes me* to the fellow, who whips the dogs," &c.—*Two Gent. of Verona, 4. 4.*
17. "*He*—*thrusts me* himself into the company of three or four gentlemanlike dogs under the Duke's table."—*Ib.*
18. "*He*—presently as greatness shows itself
Steps me a little higher than his vow
Made to my father, when his blood was poor."
Shakespeare.*
19. "*They* (*i. e.* the enemy) *had planted me* three demi-culverins just in the mouth of the breach," &c.—*B. Jons. Ev. Man in his Humour, 3. 1.*

But of all our pronouns indeterminate, the one most familiarly used is the neuter pronoun *it*. This pronoun often takes a plural signification.

* Johnson considers the *me* in Ex. 16, 17, 18 to be the oblique case of the first personal pronoun, and treats it as "a ludicrous expletive." It is difficult to say how he would have parsed Ex. 16 on such a hypothesis.

20. "Herbes he tok in an herber,
And stamped them in a mortar,
And wrong *hit* in a box."—*K. Alis.* 333.
21. "The grones of Sir Gauan, *hit* dose my hert grille."
The Antur of Arther at the Transwathelan, 49.
22. "Take to you handfuls of ashes of the furnace and let Moses
sprinkle *it* toward the heaven," &c.—*Ex.* 9. 8.
- In the following examples, *it* serves as subject to the verb, and refers to a plural or collective substantive.
23. "þo Adam was first ymad, and his ofspring wex wyðe
Heo bygonne at þe on ende of þe world al in þe east syðe
Seþpe *it* wex wyðe a boutte fro londe to londe
So þat in þe predde age it wes, ere *it* come to Engelonde."
R. Glou. 9.
24. "Walles wyðe and strong ynow, casteles as *hit* were."
R. Glou. 18.
25. "Ethelbert held Estsex, Southsex and Kent
For homage and feaute tille Adelwolf *it* went."
R. Br. 19.
26. "... Inglis and Normant er stalworth men in stoure,
It is folk valiant, ouer alle thei bere the floure."—*R. Br.* 116.
27. "He was ware of Arcite and Palamon
That foughten breme, as *it* were bolles two."
Ch. The Knightes Tale.
28. "'*T* is two or three my lord, that bring you word
Macduff is fled to England."—*Macb.* 4. 1.
29. "'*T* is these that early taint the female soul."—*Pope.*

The same pronoun is also used to represent any one of the three persons, or of the three genders.

30. "Madam, an if my brother had my shape
And I had his, Sir Robert his, like him—
And to his shape were heir to all his land,
Would I might never stir from off this place,
I'd give it every foot to have this face—
*It** would not be Sir Nob, in any case."—*K. John,* 1. 1.
31. "'*T* is I, that made thy widows."—*Cor.* 4. 4.
32. "Say not we brought it—
How was *it* we."—*Cor.* 4. 6.

* *It would* was changed to *I would* in the second folio; and this new reading has been generally adopted by later editors. Mr. Knight however follows the reading of the old folio, and construes the passage thus, "It (the face) would not be Sir Nob (*i. e.* Sir Robert's head), &c." The pun may possibly have tempted Shakespeare to use the pronoun indeterminate, but *it would* in this passage is equivalent to *I would*.

33. "And heo swor by hire Godes anon in þe place
 Ðat he ne scholde mid hire be, bute *it* one were*."
R. Glou. 33.
34. "Sire they saide nys no fole sclaunder,
 That goth by way of Alisaunder,
It is an hardy flumbarding,
 Wis and war in alle thing."—*K. Alis. 1788.*
35. "... he wol maken him doten anon rightes,
 But *it* a fend be as himselven is."—*Chau., Chan. Yem. Tale.*
36. "I take it, she that carries up the train,
 Is that same noble lady, Duchess of Norfolk——
It is, and all the rest are countesses."—*H. VIII. 4. 1.*

In certain cases, *it* takes a meaning so general and indeterminate, that it seems to refer to any thing or person connected with, or even to all the surrounding circumstances of, a transaction. In some of the following examples we might, without altering the sense, substitute *there* for *it*.

37. "Wel may men knowen, but *it* be a fool
 That," &c. *Chau., The Knightes Tale.*
38. "And who is founde hond-habbing—
It is non nede of witnessing."—*Seuyn Sages, 692.*
39. "What *hit* feol that night, hit was" (was this)†.
K. Alis. 379.
40. "How eagerly ye follow my disgraces
 As if *it* fed ye!"—*Hen. VIII. 3. 2.*

This pronoun has, for the most part, the same general meaning, when placed before what are called the impersonal verbs, as in the phrases "*it seems that*," &c., "*it pleased him to*," &c. In the Old-English phrase "*it says*," *it* signifies the book or writer alluded to, and in the phrase "*it passes*," it refers to the subject of conversation, as in Ex. 40.

41. "*It* sais in a storie, the bible may not lie,
 That," &c.—*Rob. Br. 290.*
42. "In þat 3ere, *it* sais, þe pape had grete despite
 Þorgh þe Columeis," &c.—*Rob. Br. 322.*
43. "You both love your own houses as *it* passes!"
Harr. Ep. iii. 24.

* That is, *but he were alone*.

† The use of *it* as a demonstrative is not uncommon in our language.

"I grant the lif, if thou canst tellen me
 What thing is *it*, that women most desiren."—*Chau. W. of Bathes Tale.*

"Imagine that which you would most deplore
 And that which I would speak, is *it* or more."—*Dryden.*

In the phrases *it rains, it hails, it thunders, &c.*, *it* refers to the face of external nature, which is supposed to be within the notice of all parties. Hence these phrases are perfect in themselves, and require nothing antecedent or consequent to explain them. The same presumption of mutual consciousness is necessary to explain some other constructions into which this pronoun enters.

44. "How *is it* with our general?"—*Cor.* 5. 5.

When the sentence admits two nominatives, we now make *it* the subject of the verb, *Ex.* 28, 29, 31, 32. This idiom appears to have been introduced into our written language about the close of the fourteenth century, and probably from one of our northern dialects. The Anglo-Saxon, like the modern Dutch and German, in such cases makes *it* the predicate, and the Old-English, in this particular, follows the Anglo-Saxon.

45. " *it am I*—
That loveth so hot Emelie the bright
That I wold dien present in hire sight."
Chau. The Knightes Tale.

46. "Who coude rime in English proprely
His martyrdom? forsoth *it am not I.*"—*Ibid.*

47. "..... my wittes chaungen
And all lustes fro me straungen,
That thai sain all truly
And swere that *it am not I.*"—*Gower.*

48. "wrecche man that *tu hit art*
Hwerto wultu wrestlen wið þe worldes wealdent?"
wretched man that thou art!
Wherefore wilt thou wrestle with the world's ruler?
St. Catherine, 2063.

49. "beo smart,
Alisaunder thyseolf *thow hit art.*"—*K. Alis. 4161.*

50. "O arm of the Lord, awake!—*art thou not it*, that hath cut
Rahab?—*art thou not it*, which hath dried up the sea, the
waters of the great deep?"—*Isaiah li. 9.*

51. "And he seide to hem, *ye it ben* that justifiën you before men."
Wicl. Luk. 16.

52. "For *it ben not ye* that speken, but the spirit of youre fadir,
that speketh in you."—*Wicl. Matt. 10.*

53. "Ði leor is meiden lufsum and ti muð murie and witti,
And *wise wordes hit weren*, ȝif ha neren false."
Maiden thy face is lovesome, and thy mouth sweet and witty,
And wise words were they, if they were not false.
St. Catherine, 318.

54. "þo kyng bi huld hem faste ynou (for *it muchel men were*)."
Rob. Glou. 111.
55. "*Hyt were men* of a god land, þat hem so coupe agaste."
Rob. Glou. 52.
56. "Tho, at the last espied I
That *pursevauntes and heraudes*
That crien riche folkes landes
It weren."—*Chau. H. of Fame*.
57. "For *many it ere* that strange Inglis
In ryme wate never what it is."—*Rob. Br. Prol.*
58. "Thai said if I in strange it turne
To here it many on suld skorne
For *it ere names* full selcouthe
That ere not used now in mouthe," &c.—*Rob. Br. Prol.*
59. "*Hit ar the clippes* of the sonne I herd a clerk say."
Sir Gaw and Sir Gal. 1. 8.

Clippes in the last example is a corruption of *eclipse*. The poet considers it to be a plural substantive.

In some of our eastern and northern dialects the word *the* is used as synonymous with *it*.

60. "The child will cut *theself*."—*Forby, Voc. theself*.
61. "There is neuer a sin *the* alone, but ay the mair greate and heinous that the sinne be, it hes greater and warse sinnes following on it."—*Bruce's Sermons*.
62. "*Ta* crumble all *ta* pieces."—*Moor, Suffolk Words, ta*.

As the change of the initial *th* to *t* is common in our eastern dialect, there can be little doubt that *ta* in the last example represents *the**. In the form of *ta*, this pronoun is very frequently made use of, as *ta frize, ta thow, ta snaw, &c.*, it freezes, it thaws, it snowed, &c.—*Forby and Moor, ta*. Forby also suggests that this pronoun enters into the phrases '*t is, 't was, &c.* But these contractions are much too widely spread in our language to be explained by the peculiarities of so confined a dialect, and the Dutch *het*, in like manner, often becomes *t* before the verb substantive, as '*t is koud, 't is warm, it is cold, it is warm, &c.*

It would be difficult to distinguish between this English pronoun *ta* and the German *da*, in such phrases as *da war keiner, der, &c.*, there was none who, &c. Nevertheless in such cases most German philologists consider *da* to be the adverb (*Adelung, Dict. da; Grimm's D. G. 4. 226*), though they generally recognise its pronominal cha-

* As to the change from the narrow to the broad vowel, it may be observed, that the Anglo-Saxon *þe*, in the nominative plural became *þa*, which was represented in the Old-English by *þo*. But we sometimes find the Old-English *þo* used in the singular. See *Rob. Glou. passim*, and cases may be found in the Anglo-Saxon where *þa* is also used in that number.

racter in the adverbs *da-bey*, *da-für*, *da-zu*, &c., thereby, therefore, thereto, &c. The English adverbs corresponding to those last-mentioned have *the* for their first element; thus in our northern dialect we have *the-furth*, *the-but*, *the-ben*, &c. used as synonymous with *thairfurth*, *thairbut*, *thairben*, &c., i. e. abroad, without, within*, &c. Vid. Jam. Dict.

That, which both in Anglo-Saxon and in Old-English represents the neuter of the definite article, is also used as a pronoun indeterminate. Forby, in his illustrations of *ta*, gives us the following specimens of Norfolk-speech:—"ta freeze? yes, and *that* hail too;" "do it freeze? no, *that* dont freeze now, but ta wull at night." In the Icelandic, Danish and Swedish, we have the same idiom; for instance, in the latter language, *det regnar* it rains, *det haglar* it hails, *det dunderar* it thunders, &c. Indeed in the northern languages, the representatives of the English *that* may be used for almost every purpose, to which we have seen it applied in our own language; the corresponding idioms are rare, though not altogether unknown in English.

63. "He sauh out of þe firmament an armed knyght com down,
That was S. Edmund, cruelle als a lion,
 Suerd girded, and lance in hand," &c.—*Rob. Br.* 44.

When the sentence admits of two nominatives, the present usage of our language seems to require *that* to be the subject; and we should say *that's we*, *that's you*, &c. In the Swedish also the same idiom generally prevails; though occasionally when the other nominative is plural, we find the verb agreeing with it in number, agreeably to the German usage in such phrases as *sind sie das*, is that you, &c. In like manner, we often find *that* treated as the predicate in the Old-English.

64. "nay not so—
 Another she hath tane her to,
That am I, that thou seest here."—*Ippom.* 1787.

65. "He spake to hem, that wild life parfitly
 And Lordings by your leave, *that am not I*."
Chau. Wife of Bathes Prol.

66. "And ahengen þær swa fela thefas swa næfre ær ne wæron, *that wæron* on þa litle hwile ealles feower and feowerti manne."
 And there hung they so many thieves, as never were before, that is in a little while, four and forty men in all.—*Sax. Chron.* 1124.

67. "For hire fet eau' ase don the ost'ces, *that arn hire lustes*, drahen to the eorthe."
 For their feet ever, as do the ostriches, that is, their lusts, drag on the earth.—*Inst. Mon. Titus*, D. 18, f. 37.

* The prepositions *but* and *ben* are used with especial reference to the outer and inner room of the labourer's cottage, "gae *but* (or *ben*) the house." See Jam. Dict. and Brockett's Gloss.

Such phrases as *there is*, *there lived*, &c., are very widely spread throughout the Gothic languages. They may be found alike in the Northern, the English, and the Low-Dutch dialects. Most philologists consider *there* in these phrases to be the adverb, but Molbeck describes it (and it would seem more satisfactorily) as "a kind of pronoun indeterminate."

The German *der* is used both as a demonstrative and as a relative, but only in the masculine gender. The Danish relative *der* is used for all the three genders, and for both numbers; and there seem to be traces of *there* having been used as a demonstrative in our own language.

68. "*Ther* was a verey light which lightneth ech mon, that cometh into this world."—*Wicl. Ion.* 1.

69. "They ȝede bi partise, disputed ȝer aȝein."—*Rob. Br.* 302.

70. "*Therwhile* sire that I tolde thi tale,
Thi sone mighte tho lie dethes bale."—*Seuyn Sages*, 701.

71. "Of this bodily reverence of God in his Church the government is moderate; God grant it be not loose *therewhile*."—*Laud*.

Ther aȝein in Ex. 69, belongs to the same class of phrases as the Anglo-Saxon *ƿær to*, *ƿær on*, *ƿær of*, &c.; and corresponding phrases are to be found in almost every one of the Gothic dialects. The pronominal character of *ƿær* appears to be very generally admitted by philologists. *Therwhile* in Ex. 70, 71, is synonymous with *the while*, or *meanwhile*; and the first element of this compound seems to be the same pronoun as enters into the composition of *thereto*, *thereon*, &c.

When the sentence admits of two nominatives, and the second of them is in the singular number, *there* is generally treated as the subject, *there's I*, *there's you*, &c.; and this idiom was formerly used, even when the second nominative was a plural noun.

72. "*There's two or three* of us have seen strange sights."
Jul. Cæs. 1. 3.

73. "*There is three carters*, three shepherds, &c. that have made themselves all men of hair."—*Wint. Tale.* 4. 1.

74. "*There's daggers* in men's smiles."—*Macb.* 2. 3.

75. "*There's properer women* in London, than any there I wiss."
Beau. and Flet. Kn. of the Burning Pestle, 4. 2.

In the Danish we have the same construction; *der siges* it is said, *der er dem som*, &c. there's they who, &c., *der har været mange som*, &c. there has been many who, &c. (Molb. Dict. *der*). But sometimes, when the second nominative is plural, *der* is treated as the predicate, as *der ere de som mene*, &c. there are they who think, &c.

(Rask's Dan. Gr. Sect. 41.) This is the idiom which is now generally used in our own language*.

If the first element of the compounds *thereto*, *thereon*, &c. be a pronoun, *where* and *here* must also be pronouns in the compound adverbs *whereto*, &c. *hereto*, &c. Now the German *wer*, answering to our *who*? and also to our *he*, *she*, or *they who*, is both masculine and feminine, singular and plural; and from the Icelandic *hver* who? are regularly formed the neuter *hver-t*, the genitive *hver-s*, the accusative *hver-n*, &c. Hence there seems to be little difficulty in recognising the origin of the above-mentioned compounds. The *here* in *hereto*, *hereon*, &c., seems to be the German *er* he, which was formerly written *hir*. Grimm's D. G. 1. 794.

* In such phrases as "*there live thousands who*," &c., *there* seems to be the object of the verb. In like manner the pronoun *it* is sometimes joined to neutral verbs as the object, as "*the mole courses it not on the ground*," &c. Addison; "*Let the music knock it*," Hen. VIII., 1. 3; "*to queen it*," Hen. VIII., 2. 3., &c. These idioms are common in almost all the Gothic dialects; in German we might say, "*es kommen viele freunde*," &c. there come many friends, &c.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

DECEMBER 22, 1843.

No. 15.

Professor T. H. Key in the Chair.

Professor Im. Bekker was elected an honorary member of the Society.

The following communication was then read:—

“Herodotus and the Athenians.” By the Rev. J. W. Donaldson.

Among the meagre and scanty notices of the literary history of Herodotus which have come down to our times, it is refreshing to meet with an anecdote of unquestionable authenticity which connects him with the great name of Sophocles. This anecdote has not been neglected by the philologists who have written about either Sophocles or Herodotus, but no one seems to have appreciated its full value as a contribution to literary history; for if we combine it with other testimonies which refer to the frequent intercourse of Herodotus with the Athenians in general, we may perhaps draw some important inferences as to the manner in which Herodotus composed his history, and the sources from which it was derived.

On the present occasion it is not intended to follow out this investigation to its fullest extent; but it may do some good to indicate a few steps of the process.

It appears that Sophocles, in the fifty-fifth year of his age, composed a lyric poem for Herodotus, the *ξένιον* of which began as follows (Plutarch, *an seni*, &c., c. 3. iv. 153, Wytténb.):—

Ὀμίδην Ἡροδότῳ τεύξετο Σοφοκλῆς ἐτέων ὦν
πέντ' ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα.

Now Sophocles was born B.C. 495; consequently he wrote this ode in B.C. 440. This year marks an important epoch in the life of Sophocles: at the Dionysia of this winter he brought out the most beautiful of his plays, the *Antigone*; and in consequence, as we are told, of the sound political sentiments developed in some of the speeches, the poet was immediately afterwards elected one of the *Strategi*, or *prætors*, in which capacity he sailed to Samos as the colleague of Pericles, and assisted in carrying on the war against the aristocrats, who had returned from Anæa, in B.C. 440, 439. Accordingly, if Sophocles wrote an ode for Herodotus in B.C. 440, he must have done so either before or during the Samian war in that year; for the siege of Samos lasted nine months, and it is more than probable that Sophocles did not return to Athens till B.C. 439. The fact that he wrote such a poem, proves that he had some intercourse or intimacy with Herodotus at that particular time. Herodotus,

therefore, was either at Athens or in Samos in B.C. 440, for Sophocles could not have met with him elsewhere.

From the year B.C. 452 till about the commencement of the Peloponnesian war, we must consider Samos as the home or head-quarters of the great traveller of Halicarnassus. Lygdamis, the grandson of Artemisia, and tyrant of Halicarnassus, had put to death Panyasis the epic poet, who was the maternal uncle of Herodotus, and had compelled the historian to fly from his native city. Herodotus took refuge in Samos, and though he afterwards succeeded in putting down the tyranny of Lygdamis, he was not able to re-establish himself at Halicarnassus, but settled in the home of his adoption, and in consequence of this became first an Ionian and afterwards an Athenian.

The frequent communication between Athens and Samos might lead us to expect that Herodotus, who was so fond of travelling, would occasionally put himself on board a merchant-ship and visit the city of Pericles. We are told that he was there at the great Panathenæa in B.C. 446, when he recited a portion of his history, which was so flattering or agreeable to the Athenians, that ten talents from the public treasury were voted to him on the motion of Anytus (Plutarch *de malignit. Herodot.* c. 26). Another of the panegyrist of Athens, Pindar, was similarly rewarded; and we may well imagine, that as his works were well known to Herodotus, there may have been some passages between them of which history is silent. Sophocles, at any rate, who was then at the height of his reputation, could not have failed to make the acquaintance of a man to whose literary merits his countrymen had awarded so high a recompense.

Honoured and rewarded by the people of Athens, Herodotus, it might be supposed, would take up his residence there: but there is no evidence for this supposition, and it seems much more probable that he continued to reside at Samos; so that Sophocles, when he went to that island in B.C. 440, would find his friend there, and as he seems to have preserved his constitutional tranquillity and cheerfulness in the midst of his official and military occupations, he may have amused himself in some leisure moment with writing the fugitive poem which has furnished us with this important date.

It is well known that Herodotus was ultimately one of those who joined the great Grecian settlement at Thurii. Now this colony was conducted by Lampon, B.C. 443, and it is clear that Herodotus must have been at Athens after B.C. 437 (see Herod. v. 77). It appears the most reasonable inference that Herodotus, after the taking of Samos in B.C. 439, became a *μέτοικος* at Athens, and, like other *μέτοικοι* (Lysias, Polemarchus, &c.), joined the Thurian colony about the commencement of the Peloponnesian war.

This view of the successive settlements of Herodotus appears to contribute materially towards a simplification of his biography. For the first thirty-two years of his life (B.C. 484–452) he was a subject of the king of Persia, and as such possessed the greatest advantages for travelling in every satrapy of the Persian empire. If Halicarnassus had

been a free state, it would never have been immortalized by the name of its only *great* historian. For the next twenty years (from B.C. 452 to the beginning of the Peloponnesian war) we must consider Herodotus as a distinguished foreigner settled at Samos,—an honoured friend of the Athenians. For the rest of his life he was an Athenian *μέτοικος*, living chiefly as an Athenian colonist at Thurii, and engaged in systematizing and harmonizing into one great whole the historical narratives and traveller's tales by which he had gained his great reputation.

Plutarch charges Herodotus with partiality to Athens. We, who live at this distance of time and place, are all partial to Athens: we would conceal all her faults and exaggerate all her virtues: how then can we blame the true-hearted Halicarnassean if he was dazzled by the brilliancy which sometimes imposes even on our northern vision?

But Herodotus was an admirer, not only of Athens in general, but of Sophocles in particular. Herodotus was, perhaps, of all the Greeks the most cosmopolitan,—the most free from Hellenistic prejudices: still he could not have failed to appreciate the most Greek of all the Greeks.

The more we read Herodotus, the more we must be convinced that the writings of Sophocles were well known to him. He was a great traveller and observer, but he was, for those days, a great reader also. He frequently refers to the writings of other poets, Pindar, Alcæus, &c.; but the chief subject of his meditations must have been the profound and difficult poetry of that great Athenian. This may be inferred from the circumstance, that while he quotes other writers by name, he introduces his imitations of whole passages of Sophocles without so much as alluding to the author. Some of these quotations are so minute and circumstantial, that the hypothesis of accidental coincidence is altogether inadmissible.

To begin with the least doubtful of these citations, we find that, in the *third* book of his history, which contains more references to Samos than any other, Herodotus introduces the story of Intaphernes, whose wife gives the following reason for preferring her brother to the other prisoners (iii. 119): "O king, I might get another husband if I had good luck, and other children if I were to lose these; but, as I have no longer any father or mother, I know no means of getting another brother." Now in the *Antigone* of Sophocles, which was acted just before the tragedian went to Samos, where he probably met Herodotus, we find Antigone arguing in precisely the same manner. Since the whole argument is a conceit, it is much more reasonable to suppose that Herodotus introduced it into the speech which he *made* for the wife of Intaphernes, than that Sophocles borrowed it from a history, which, for all that we know, was not published till many years after. Even supposing that Herodotus wrote his *third* book before the performance of the *Antigone*, and supposing that Sophocles was well acquainted with that portion of his history, how unlikely is it that he would recollect the terms and phrases of a prose narrative, and preserve in his iambic dialogue the

sentences of a λέξις εἰρομένη! If, on the other hand, we adopt the more reasonable supposition, that the third book of Herodotus was written subsequently to the performance of the *Antigone*, and that Herodotus was acquainted with that play, we shall at once understand how Herodotus converted into Ionic prose the lines which had made an indelible impression upon his memory, and how he was led by the parallelism of circumstances to commit one of the most excusable of plagiarisms. Scholars in general think that Sophocles borrowed from Herodotus; but one cannot understand how this could be, and Valckenaer, who first remarked the resemblance between the two passages, seems to have made it clear, by the comparison which he instituted, that Sophocles was the original author of the sentiment. If any competent scholar will place each line in the passage from the *Antigone* (v. 924) by the side of the corresponding clause in the narrative of Herodotus, he will find that the latter is a prosaic paraphrase of the former, and nothing more:—

- Soph. πόσις μὲν ἂν μοί, καθανόντος, ἄλλος ᾗν.
 Herod. ἀνὴρ μὲν μοι ἂν ἄλλος γένοιτο, εἰ δαίμων ἐθέλοι.
 Soph. καὶ παῖς ἀπ' ἄλλου φωτὸς εἰ τοῦδ' ἡμπλακον.
 Herod. καὶ τέκνα ἄλλα εἰ ταῦτ' ἀποβάλοιμι.
 Soph. μητρὸς δ' ἐν Ἀίδου καὶ πατρὸς κεκευθότοιιν.
 Herod. πατρὸς δὲ καὶ μητρὸς οὐκ ἔτι μεν ζώντων.
 Soph. οὐκ ἔστ' ἀδελφὸς ὅστις ἂν βλάστοι ποτέ.
 Herod. ἀδελφεὸς ἂν ἄλλος οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ γένοιτο.

Surely no one can read this without seeing that Herodotus must have based the passage on a recollection on the lines of his friend Sophocles.

But this is by no means the only passage in which Herodotus evinces a recollection of the writings of Sophocles. The celebrated saying of Solon (Herod. i. 32) must surely have been more familiar to his countrymen than to Herodotus. It is absurd to suppose that the dialogues and speeches in Herodotus have a real historical foundation. We can prove that some of the compositions are made up of γνῶμαι borrowed from Greek poets. The speeches of the Persian conspirators in book iii. 80 sqq., in spite of the ἐλέχθησαν δ' ὦν of the author, must be regarded as pure fabrications; indeed they are absolutely Greek throughout. Similarly with regard to the saying of Solon, it is likely enough that Herodotus borrowed it from Sophocles (see *Œd. Tyr.* v. 1528 sqq., and *Trach. init.*, where it is called "an ancient saying").

Again in iii. 52, 53, among many other references to Greek poets who lived long after Periander, there are four distinct imitations of the phraseology of Sophocles:—(a) c. 52: κήρυγμα ἐποιήσατο, ὃς ἂν ἡ οἰκίοισι ὑποδέξηται μιν, κ. τ. λ. Cf. Soph. *Œd. T.* 235: μήτ' εἰσδέχεσθαι, κ. τ. λ. (b) c. 53: βούλει τήν τε τυραννίδα ἐς ἄλλους πεσέειν, καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς διαφορηθέντα (cf. i. 88). Soph. *Aj.* 510: εἰ νέας τροφῆς στέρηθεις σοῦ διοίσεται μόνος ὑπ' ὀρφανιστῶν μὴ φίλων. (c) *ibid.* φιλοτιμίη κτῆμα σκαιόν. Cf. Soph. *Antig.* 1015: αὐθαδία σκαιότητ' ὀφλισκάνει. (d) *ibid.*: μὴ τῷ κακῷ τὸ κακὸν ἰῶ.

Soph. *Alcædæ*, ap. Stob. iv. 37: ἐνταῦθα μέντοι πάντα τὰνθρώπων νοσεῖ; κακοῖς δταν θέλωσιν ἰᾶσθαι κακά.

Another instance of a similar imitation of Sophocles is found in iv. 129, where the ὀρθὰ ἰσάντες τὰ ὦτα is supposed by Valckenaer and others to be a citation of the celebrated passage in Soph. *Electra*, 27: ἀλλ' ὀρθὸν οὖς ἴστησιν. As in the passage last quoted, so in this the historian seems to have had Pindar in his eye as well as Sophocles. Herodotus, in speaking of the braying of the asses, uses the singular phrase: ὑβρίζοντες ὧν ὄνοι ἐτάρασσον τὴν ἵππον τῶν Σκυθέων. That by ὑβρίζοντες he means the braying of the asses, is clear from what follows: μεταξὺ ὅκως ἀκούσειαν οἱ ἵπποι τῶν ὄνων τῆς φωνῆς ἐταράσσοντο. Now Pindar in his tenth Pythian ode, which was written before the birth of Herodotus, speaks thus of the asses led to sacrifice by the Hyperboreans (v. 36): Ἀπόλλων γελᾷ ὀρῶν ὕβριν ὀρθίαν κνωδάλων, i. e. "he laughs when he sees the loud-voiced wantonness of the asses." If it is objected that ὀρῶν cannot refer to the sense of hearing, some might justify the confusion by quoting κτύπον δέδορκα, &c. But it seems more probable that the poet refers generally to the spectacle of an ass in a state of ὕβρις, of which the most remarkable feature is its bray, and it must be owned that this is a spectacle ridiculous enough in the eyes of men and gods. Pindar, then, would mean by ὕβρις that the ass was in a state of clamorous and amorous excitement, implying by the epithet ὀρθίαν that he was braying; and Herodotus, copying him, would take the more general word in the particular signification. This appears to be a proof that he was the copyist of Pindar and not the originator of this peculiar use of the verb ὑβρίζω. Similarly, one might infer that Hesiod's phrase ἐπέων νομὸς (*Op. et D.* 403) was borrowed from the longer and more elaborate parallel passage in Homer, *Il.* xx. 244 *sqq.*

But if the style of Herodotus was affected by his acquaintance with the context of older writers, and of Sophocles in particular there were at least two Athenian writers—if we can call them Athenians—whose style received a tinge from the Herodotean λέξις εἰρομένη. There can be little doubt that the ἀφελὴς λόγος of Lysias, no less than the κοινὴ διάλεκτος of Xenophon, were based upon Herodotus; for while there is no other style which they so much resemble, the presumption of an intercourse between Lysias and Herodotus, who were fellow-citizens of Thurii, and, with regard to Xenophon, the express testimony of the rhetorician Dionysius (*de præcip. Histor.* p. 777 Reiske), may induce us to believe that this resemblance was not accidental, but intentional in both cases. Lysias was an Athenian in the same sense as Herodotus:—originally a μέτοικος, he joined the colony of Thurii, and afterwards returned to Athens, the home of his adoption. That Herodotus became acquainted with Lysias at Thurii and noticed his early promise, as he is said to have done in the case of Thucydides, is not stated, but it is at least possible that such was the case. It is, however, a most probable supposition that Xenophon, a traveller like Herodotus, would endeavour to appropriate the style which had made the Halicar-

nassean's history so popular. It is true, that as Herodotus was connected with a family of epic poets, he would introduce into his style more of the epic or Ionic dialect than could be expected from the would-be Athenian philosopher, to whom all rhapsodies and all poetry were an abomination. But set this aside, and we cannot fail to recognise in the writings of Xenophon, and especially in his later works, as strong a resemblance to the diction of the "nine Muses," as the ungenial and unpoetic soul of the banished mercenary could devise or execute.

The inferences to be drawn from these and other indications of a contact between the Athenians and Herodotus are the following:—

First, Herodotus must have regarded that part of his work which he originally composed as a sort of *epopæa*, and he must have recited it as such at the public assemblies of the Greeks. What Choerilus attempted in verse, Herodotus more successfully achieved in prose, namely an account of the Persian war, which won applause from the Greeks assembled at Olympia, and obtained very solid marks of approbation from the Athenians, when the author made it the subject of an epideixis at the great Panathenæan festival.

Secondly, the work, as we now have it, was composed in accordance with a much more comprehensive plan. The author having retired to Thurii, as an Athenian *μέτοικος*, proceeded, in the leisure which he there enjoyed, to put together the results of all his previous investigations. The great work which he there composed embodied the smaller books which he had previously recited or published: but even these books were much enlarged and improved before they were incorporated in the greater history. In general he seems to have written this Thurian history, not only as an Athenian (he called himself *ὁ Θούριος*, Aristot. *Rhet.* iii. 9), but for the Athenians. Almost all the references which he makes to events which occurred subsequently to the Persian war are taken from Athenian history, or based upon information which he must have derived from Athenians. It is pretty clear from the phraseology of certain passages that he was not and had not recently been in Greece at the time when he composed his history as we now have it (cf. v. 77, viii. 121, &c.), but that he was in Italy and in the southern part of the peninsula (iv. 15, 99). In his *hand-book* for Scythia he speaks as one who would write for the information of Athenian navigators,—as a geographer in fact, and not as a traveller. For example, in iv. 18, when he describes the position of the *Ὑλαίη* or "woodland district," he says: *ἀτὰρ διαβάντι τὸν Βορυσθένα ἀπὸ θαλάσσης, πρῶτον μὲν ἡ Ὑλαίη, i. e.* "if you pass the Borysthenes coming from the sea, the first district on the other side of the river is the Hylæa." It is clear that the Hylæa must have been on the right bank of the river, but this position would have been differently described if the author had spoken as a traveller journeying by land from the Danube to the Don. It is also a reasonable inference that, as Herodotus makes no mention of Rome, or of any other great or nascent power in Italy, he did not travel a great deal after he had once settled down at Thurii. He seems to have spent the latter half of his long life in

comparative quiet and seclusion, studying such books as he could get, and reducing to writing, by the aid of an excellent memory, all the observations which he had made during his earlier and more active years. In a word, we are to consider Herodotus as one, who, having discovered his literary faculty in the brief epideixis which he wrote on the Persian war, and having, perhaps in consequence of this, become a favoured *μέτοικος* of the Athenians, spent the long years of leisure which he enjoyed as an Athenian subject, in grouping around that original centre the results of all his manifold journeyings and observations, making them all tend to that, and stringing every successive episode on the connecting thread of the international contacts of the Persians and the Greeks.

On Friday, January the 26th, the following paper will be read:—

“On the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands” (continued). By the Rev. R. Garnett.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

JANUARY 26, 1844.

No. 16.

Professor Wilson in the Chair.

The Chairman announced that a letter had been received from Mr. Cornwall Lewis, calling the attention of the Council to a subject of great importance, namely, the compilation of a dictionary devoted to the archaic and provincial terms of the English language. The Society certainly possessed within itself facilities for carrying such an object into effect, which were not probably at the command of any single individual; still many difficulties presented themselves, and the Council would not commit themselves to the recommendation of any specific plan without the most mature deliberation. He was, however, authorized to state, that they would gladly receive, either from the members of the Society or other sources, any information which might tend to illustrate the past or present condition of our provincial dialects. It was believed that many gentlemen had made collections of provincial words, used in their respective neighbourhoods, which were little likely ever to be published in a separate form, but which would be of the greatest service in the compilation of a dictionary such as the one contemplated. All lists of this description entrusted to the Society would be preserved with care, and might eventually be made available for the above-mentioned design.

The following paper was then read:—

“On the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands:”—*Continued.* By the Rev. R. Garnett.

We now come to the portion of the subject most immediately interesting to ourselves,—the inquiry how far the Celtic dialects appear to have influenced the current language of England. Though this at first sight appears a simple question, it is not without its difficulties; at least, there are many points on which we cannot arrive at absolute certainty. Our parent language, the Anglo-Saxon, is, as a whole, very distinct from Welsh, or any other Celtic dialect; still there is a certain affinity between them, and it is necessary to distinguish carefully between what has been derived from what is merely collateral. Again, where terms have been actually adopted, it is not always clear which was the borrowing party. When different races are in contact there is generally some interchange of vocables, and after ~~a~~ lapse of many centuries it is not in every case practicable to ascertain the original proprietorship. Moreover, Welsh and Armorican are partially *Romanized* languages, yet having many original roots closely cognate with the Latin; so that, in at-

tempting to eliminate mere Latinized words, it is often difficult to know where to stop. Adelung, the author of 'Mithridates,' appears to have regarded the Germanic and Celtic languages as radically unconnected with each other; and, in pursuance of this idea, gives a long list of terms ostensibly borrowed by the Celts from their neighbours. On this one of his countrymen, much his superior as a comparative philologist, makes the following judicious remarks:—

"Adelung's comparison of modern Celtic words with Latin and German is very far from satisfactorily establishing the point which among others he attempts to deduce from it, namely, that the Cymru are undoubted descendants of the Belgæ, who are described by Cæsar as much intermixed with Germans; and who consequently, on their emigration to Britain, brought with them many terms adapted from the Low German. Now many of the words alleged by him are not borrowed at all; and respecting others, it may be questioned whether they were not, on the contrary, borrowed by the Germans from the Celts. To answer such nice questions properly requires a more profound and comprehensive investigation than has hitherto fallen to the lot of this class of languages. In some words the determination is easy; in some difficult; in others, perhaps, absolutely impossible. In future it will be necessary carefully to separate what is really extraneous from the Celtic tongues before they can be safely employed for ethnographical or philological purposes. Little attention has hitherto been paid to this matter, and consequently a helpless confusion has arisen with respect to these languages and their genealogical relation to other branches, which it will cost endless trouble to unravel*."

It is not our present purpose to enter upon the comprehensive field here pointed out, though we may furnish a few hints and data towards its fuller exploration. The inquiry with which we are more immediately concerned is, whether the Germanic tribes, and more particularly the Anglo-Saxons, adopted words of Celtic origin, and to what extent? That some such process did take place is probable in itself and confirmed by the experience of many parallel cases. The Romans themselves adopted various Gallic words; and our intercourse with the East has served to introduce a number of Persian, Indian and even Chinese terms into our own language. It is, moreover, evident from the account given by Cæsar and others, that the Gauls, though inferior to the Greeks and Romans in civilization, were more advanced than the Germans; and we know that the colonial Britons, prior to the breaking up of the Roman Empire, had acquired all the useful and ornamental arts of the Romans. The invading Franks and Anglo-Saxons consequently found many implements, processes and artificial productions, of which they previously knew little or nothing; and what is more likely than that they should partially adopt the names by which they were designated? We may also easily conceive that they would be occasionally struck by the apparent oddity of the words current among the conquered race, and employ

* Pott. (ap. Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopædia); Art. INDOGERMANISCHER SPRACHSTAMM.

them themselves in a familiar or ludicrous sense, in the same way that *flash* terms are frequently used by educated Englishmen. An instance of each description will help to illustrate our meaning. We know from Martial that *bascauda* was a British word in the time of Domitian; and there is not the smallest reason to doubt that the Welsh *basgawd* and our own *basket* are perfectly identical with it in origin. Again, the verb *to bother* is seldom used by ourselves except in the comic or familiar style; but in the Irish, from which we originally adopted it, it is a perfectly serious word, and occurs repeatedly in the Scriptures in the sense or *mente affligi* or *conturbari*. The same observations might be extended to other classes of words; but to proceed to our immediate object of showing how far those influences have operated upon our current speech, we shall first produce a select list of terms relating to the ordinary arts of life, such as agriculture, masonry, carpentry, cookery, needle-work, &c., &c., which appear to be of Celtic origin. A few French, Italian and Germanic terms will be given for the sake of illustration, as also some apparently of Latin origin, when there appears reason to believe that they were adopted from the Celtic inhabitants of the island, and not from the Latin or Anglo-Norman.

Welsh.

*basgawd	basket.
berfa	barrow.
botwm	button.
brag, <i>malt, whence</i>	{ brasium, Lat. barb. bragget.
bragcdlyn, <i>spiced wort</i>	
bràn, <i>skin of wheat</i>	bran.
brat, <i>clout, rag</i>	brat, <i>a child's pinafore</i> , Yorksh.
brodiaw, <i>to darn, embroider</i>	broder, Fr. broider, E.
brywes, <i>bread dipt in dripping, &c.</i>	brewis, Yorksh.
bwyell, <i>hatchet</i>	Ger. beil; E. bill.
cab, caban, <i>hut</i>	cabin.
cae, <i>enclosure, hedge</i>	quay.
caman, <i>road</i>	Ital. camino; Fr. chemin.
càn, <i>white</i>	{ caned, <i>applied to vinegar, &c.</i> , full of white flakes.
cawg, <i>cup</i>	
ceubal, <i>boat</i>	coggie, Sc.
clwt, <i>patch, clytiaw, to patch</i>	cobble.
cnap, <i>button</i>	{ clout. knob.
cnwb, <i>knob</i>	
craff, <i>clasp, brace</i>	cramp-iron; Fr. agraffe.
crampoez, Br. (Corn. crampothen)	crumpet.
crochan, <i>a pot</i>	crock, crockery.
crog, <i>a hook</i>	crook.
crogi, <i>to hang, suspend</i>	Fr. crocher, accrocher.

* The Celtic terms in the following lists are Welsh, except when otherwise specified. Ff represents the ordinary f. Single f is pronounced like v. Abbreviations: —W. Welsh; G. Gaelic; Br. Breton; Fr. French; Ital. Italian; Ger. German; Sc. Lowland Scotch; Prov. Provincial.

Welsh.

crwt, <i>a crust</i>	Fr. crouste.
cwch, <i>boat</i>	cock-boat.
cwysed (from cwys, <i>ridge, furrow</i>)	gusset.
cyllell, <i>a knife</i>	Sc. gully.
cyl, cylyn	kill, Prov.; kiln, Eng.
chwiogen, <i>cake, manchet</i>	whig, Yorksh., <i>a sweetened cake</i> .
dantaeth, <i>choice morsel</i>	dainty.
darn, <i>a patch</i>	darn.
deintur, <i>frame for stretching cloth</i>	tenter.
dref, <i>bundle</i> ; drefa, <i>24 sheaves</i> . .	threave.
ffasg, <i>a bundle</i>	fadge, Yorksh.
fflaim, <i>cattle-lancet</i>	fleam.
fflasged, <i>large wicker vessel</i>	flasket, Yorksh., <i>a pail</i> .
fflaw, <i>shiver, splinter</i>	flaw.
ffris, <i>nap of cloth</i>	frieze.
ffynel, <i>air-hole, chimney</i>	funnel.
gaflach, <i>fork</i>	gavelock, <i>iron crow</i> .
gardas (gar, <i>shank, tas, tie</i>)	garter.
gefyn, <i>fetter</i>	gyve.
greidell, <i>iron baking-plate</i>	griddle.
grual	gruel.
gwain, <i>a carriage</i>	wain.
gwall, <i>rampart</i>	wall.
gwald, <i>hem, border</i>	welt.
gwdyn, <i>a with</i>	woodie, Sc.
gwialen, <i>a rod</i>	gaule, Fr.
gwiced, <i>little door</i>	wicket.
gwlanen (from gwlan, <i>wool</i>)	flannel; Heref. flannen.
gwlyb, <i>liquor</i>	flip.
gwn, <i>robe</i>	gown.
gwyfr	wire.
gwyntell, <i>basket</i>	{ windle, <i>measure of capacity</i> , Lancashire.
gwyth, <i>channel, water-course</i> . . .	{ goit, <i>a mill-course</i> ; also a river in Cheshire.
heislan, heisyllt, <i>instrument to dress</i> <i>flax</i>	{ hatchell, hackle.
hem, <i>a border</i>	hem.
hob, <i>measure of capacity</i>	hoop, <i>qr. of a peck</i> , N. Yorksh.
hws, <i>a covering</i> ; hwsan, <i>a hood</i> . .	housing.
hwff, <i>a hood</i>	howve, O. Eng.
kadak, Br. (G. adhag) <i>shock of</i> <i>corn</i>	{ hattock, Yorksh.
llath, <i>rod</i>	lath.
llogell, <i>drawer, partition</i>	locker.
llwyar, <i>a spoon</i>	löffel, Ger.
llymry, <i>jelly made with oatmeal</i> . .	flummery.
masg, <i>stitch in netting</i>	mesh.
magl, <i>stitch in knitting</i>	maille, Fr.

Welsh.

matog.	mattock.
mop, mopa, <i>maukin</i> , &c.	mop.
mwrthwyl, <i>hammer</i>	martello, Ital.
paeol, <i>a pail or pot</i>	pail.
pan, <i>cup, bowl</i>	pan.
parc, <i>field, inclosure</i>	park.
parsel, <i>shooting-butt</i>	bersaglio, Ital.
peg, <i>pegged, a measure</i>	peck.
peled, <i>little ball, bullet</i>	pellet.
picyn, <i>a small hooped vessel</i>	piggin.
piser, <i>a jug</i> (Bret. <i>picher</i>)	pitcher.
potes, <i>a cooked mess</i>	pottage.
plymwriaeth, <i>lead-work</i>	{ bloomery, <i>melting furnace, foundry</i> .
posned, <i>saucepan</i>	posnet, Yorksh.
rhail, <i>a fence, mound</i>	rail.
rhasg, <i>a slice</i>	rasher.
rhasgliaw, <i>to slice off, rasp</i>	râcler, Fr.
rhic, rhig, <i>notch, groove</i>	ridge.
rhigol, <i>trench, drain</i>	rigole, Fr.
rhill, <i>a row</i>	drill.
rhim, <i>raised edge or border</i>	rim.
rhuwch, <i>rough garment</i>	rug.
sawduriaw, <i>to join, cement</i>	solder.
saim, <i>grease</i>	seam, <i>lard</i> , Prov.
soch, <i>sink, drain</i>	sough.
sopen, <i>lump, bunch</i>	sop, Prov. <i>lump of hay</i> .
swmer, <i>a beam</i>	summer-tree.
syth, <i>stiffening, glue, &c.</i>	size.
tacl, <i>instrument, tool</i>	tackle.
taradr, <i>an auger</i>	tarrière, Fr.
tasel, <i>fringe, tuft</i>	tassel.
teddu, <i>to spread</i>	ted, <i>to spread hay</i> .
tincerdd, <i>literally, tail-trade, lowest craft</i>	{ tinker; cf. Sc. caird.
torth, <i>loaf</i> , Br. <i>tartez, cake</i>	tart; Fr. <i>tourte</i> .
tres, <i>chain or strap for drawing</i>	trace.
trul, <i>a borer</i>	drill; Ital. <i>trivella</i> .
truliaw, <i>to bore</i> }	
ystwc, <i>shock of corn</i>	stook, N. Eng.

Some thousands of familiar terms, to all appearance Celtic, might be collected from the various Romance and Germanic languages, especially from the provincial dialects. The following list, selected from a much larger one, may serve as a specimen:—

anterth, <i>forenoon</i>	oandurth, }	Lancashire.
enderv, Br., <i>afternoon</i>	yeandurth, }	
asbri, <i>trick, mischief</i>	spree?	
baldorddus, <i>prating</i>	balderdash.	

Welsh.

bas, <i>low, shallow</i>	bas, Fr. ; base ?
bamein, Br., <i>to bewitch, cheat</i>	bam, <i>imposition</i> .
blew, <i>hair of animals</i>	flew, O. Eng. ; <i>fur</i> .
blod, Br., <i>soft, tender</i>	{ blöd, Dan., <i>soft</i> (metaph., <i>soft</i> , timid ; Sc. blate.)
bourd, Br., <i>trick, jest</i>	bourd, Sc.
braoued, Br. ; <i>potio cocta</i>	brodo, Ital. ; <i>broth</i> .
broud, Br., <i>goad, point</i>	prod, Prov.
burel, Br., <i>coarse cloth</i>	borel, O. Eng.
bwg, <i>hobgoblin</i>	bug, <i>bugbear</i> .
bwgwl, <i>ditto</i>	bogle, Sc.
bygylu, <i>to threaten</i>	bully.
byrdew, <i>short and thick, squabby</i> . .	purdy, Durham.
carawl, (<i>properly love-song</i>)	carol.
cebyr, <i>rafter</i> (Br. kebr, <i>a couple</i>)	chevron.
cecys, <i>hemlock</i>	kex.
cefn (Br. kein), <i>back</i>	chine.
ceitlen, <i>smock-frock</i>	kittel, Ger.
cic, <i>foot</i> ; ciciaw, <i>strike with the</i> <i>foot</i>	{ kick.
cil, <i>recess</i>	gill, N. Eng., <i>a ravine</i> .
cluder, <i>heap, pile</i>	cluther, Yorksh.
cludeiriaw, <i>gather in a heap</i> }	
cnipws, <i>a fillip</i>	nawp, Yorksh.
cnoc, <i>a rap</i>	knock.
cnòl, <i>round summit, hillock</i>	knoll.
cnul, cnull, <i>passing bell</i>	knell ; knoll, Yorksh.
cob, <i>a thump</i>	cob, <i>cobbing</i> .
coblyn, <i>a sprite</i>	goblin ; cf. Ger. kobold.
cocru, <i>to indulge</i>	cocker.
cog, <i>truncheon</i> ; cogel, <i>short staff</i>	cudgel.
crim, <i>crimp, ridge</i>	crimp.
crimpiaw, <i>to raise in ridges</i> }	
cris, <i>scale, crust</i> ; crisb, <i>crisp coat-</i> <i>ing</i> ; crisblu, <i>crumbling</i>	{ crisp.
crwth, <i>fiddle</i>	
crythwr, <i>fiddler</i> }	crowd, crowder.
crwcan, <i>to bend</i> ; crwcwd, <i>squat-</i> <i>ting</i> ; cwrc, cwrcwd, <i>id.</i>	{ crouch.
cwrian, <i>to squat</i>	cower.
cwta, <i>short</i>	cutty, Sc.
cwtws, <i>a lot</i>	cut (<i>draw cuts</i>).
cwll, <i>separation</i> ; cyllu, <i>separate</i> . .	cull.
chwant, <i>desire</i>	want.
chwap, <i>smart stroke</i>	whap.
chwedleua, <i>to prate, gossip</i>	twaddle.
dwn, <i>dusky</i> (Gael. don, <i>brown</i>) . .	dun.
elv, Bret., <i>white poplar</i>	alb, Ger.
esmwyth, <i>even, soft</i>	smooth.

Welsh.

<i>fagl, blaze, flame</i>	<i>fackel, Ger. torch.</i>
<i>filawg (properly starting, skittish),</i>	} <i>filly.</i>
<i>a young mare</i>	
<i>foriwr, explorer, scout</i>	<i>foriere, Ital.</i>
<i>fug, deception</i>	<i>fudge.</i>
<i>fwg, dry grass</i>	<i>fog; Yorksh. eddish; Sc. moss.</i>
<i>fwrw, fwrwr, down</i>	<i>fur.</i>
<i>fwtog, scut, short tail</i>	<i>fud; Prov. Ger. and Sc.</i>
<i>gil, fermentation</i>	<i>gyle-fat, Yorksh.; wort-tub.</i>
<i>glwth, voracious</i>	<i>glouton, Fr.; glutton.</i>
<i>glyn, valley</i>	<i>glen.</i>
<i>grawn, roe of fishes</i>	<i>rawn, N. Eng.</i>
<i>grymialu, to murmur</i>	<i>grumble.</i>
<i>gwammalu, to waver</i>	<i>wamble, wabble.</i>
<i>gwastel, Bret., cake</i>	<i>wastel; O. Fr. gastel.</i>
<i>gwariaw, to spend</i>	<i>ware, Yorksh.</i>
<i>gwas, youth, servant</i>	} <i>vassus, vassallus, Lat. barb.;</i>
<i>gwasawl, serving</i>	
<i>gweddu, to yoke, unite, marry</i> . . .	<i>vassal.</i>
<i>gwica, to carry about for sale</i> } . .	<i>wed.</i>
<i>gwicawr, pedlar</i>	<i>hawk, hawker.</i>
<i>gwichyn, a pole-cat</i>	<i>fitch, fitchet.</i>
<i>gwyal, mark</i>	<i>goal.</i>
<i>gwychr, valiant</i>	<i>wacker, Ger.</i>
<i>gwylaw, to weep</i>	<i>wail.</i>
<i>hebog, accipiter</i>	<i>hawk.</i>
<i>hecian, to halt, limp</i>	<i>hitch.</i>
<i>herlawd, a youth</i>	<i>harlot, O. Eng.; a man servant.</i>
<i>herlodes, a hoyden</i>	<i>harlot, meretrix.</i>
<i>hochi, to expectorate</i>	<i>hawk.</i>
<i>hoeden, a flirt</i>	<i>hoyden.</i>
<i>hwch, a swine</i>	<i>hog.</i>
<i>llachiaw, to cudgel</i>	<i>lick.</i>
<i>llaw, hand; llawf, palm</i>	<i>lofi, Isl.; loof, Sc.</i>
<i>llawd, youth</i>	<i>lad.</i>
<i>llodes, a girl</i>	<i>lass.</i>
<i>llithraw, to glide, slip</i>	<i>slidder, Prov.</i>
<i>llug, partial; in comp. e. gr.</i> } . .	<i>lukewarm.</i>
<i>llugdwym, tepid</i>	
<i>llumon, chimney</i>	<i>lum, Sc.</i>
<i>loumber, Br. ditto</i>	<i>loover, Prov.</i>
<i>madredd, pus</i>	<i>matter.</i>
<i>mollt, a wether</i>	} <i>moulton, O. Fr.; montone, Ital.;</i>
<i>mwygl, tepid, sultry</i>	<i>a ram; mutton.</i>
<i>nugiaw, to shake</i>	<i>muggy.</i>
<i>osi, to attempt, venture</i>	<i>nudge.</i>
<i>pan, down, fur, nap</i>	<i>oss, Lancash.</i>
<i>paneg, penygen, entrails</i>	<i>pane, O. Eng.</i>
	<i>paunch.</i>

Welsh.

piciaw, <i>to throw</i>	pitch.
pigwn, <i>turret, alarm-tower, &c.</i>	beacon.
pinc, <i>smart, gay</i>	pink, <i>to adorn, &c.</i>
posiaw, <i>to interrogate, embarrass</i>	pose, puzzle.
priawd, <i>possessed, owned, spouse</i> . .	} bride.
priodas, <i>marriage</i> ; priodi, <i>to marry</i>	
pwea, <i>hobgoblin</i>	puck.
pwmp, <i>round mass</i> ; dim. pwmpl, <i>knob, &c.</i>	} bump, pimple.
pwtian, <i>to thrust, butt</i>	
rhawd, <i>a drove, heap</i>	put, pote, Prov.; <i>to poke, butt</i> .
ruth, Corn., <i>ditto</i>	rout, O. Eng., <i>a crowd</i> .
rhwyb, <i>to tear, snatch</i>	routh, Sc., <i>abundance</i> .
rhwyg, <i>ditto</i>	rive.
skor, Br., <i>prop, stay</i>	rug, Sc., <i>to tear</i> .
skourjez (fr. skourr, <i>branch, &c.</i>)	shore.
sil, Br., <i>strainer</i>	scourge.
souba, Br., <i>to dip</i>	sile, Yorksh.
soegi, <i>to steep</i>	sop, soup.
stanka, Br., <i>to dam up, obstruct</i> . .	soak.
tal, <i>lofty, of high stature</i>	stanch.
tariaw, <i>to loiter, stay</i>	tall.
tasg, <i>a job, piece-work</i>	tarry.
tociaw, <i>to cut short</i>	task.
topyn, <i>a crest</i>	dock.
tosiaw, <i>to jerk, throw</i>	toppin, Yorksh.
tripiaw, <i>to stumble</i>	toss.
troddi, <i>move forward, progress</i> . .	trip; cf. Fr. trebucher.
trwyn, <i>a snout</i>	trudge.
wyna, oena, <i>to bear lambs</i>	trogne, Fr.
	yeau.

The above examples, which are not a twentieth part of what might be alleged, will, it is presumed, show how necessary it is for the etymologist to take the Celtic element into consideration in the investigation of the languages of Western Europe. It is believed that most of the above terms are genuine Celtic, though it is possible that in a few cases the counterparts given may not be *derived* from them, but only collateral. It may, however, be observed, that the finding an isolated term in an Anglo-Saxon or German vocabulary by no means proves it to be *vernacular* to that language. Many words occur in 'Lye's Dictionary,' for instance, derived from the glossaries of the eleventh century, which are notoriously not genuine Anglo-Saxon, and cannot be traced to any known roots in the Germanic tongues. For instance, we find *comb*, a valley, which is not Saxon nor ever was, being evidently the Welsh *cwm*. It is obvious that many other terms may be in the same predicament; even the presence of a word in a number of ancient dialects does not prove it to belong to that class of languages. It will be sufficient for the present to adduce a single example.

The word *leather*, in one form or other, occurs in all the Celtic and most of the Teutonic dialects; the question, therefore, is to determine in which it is most likely to be vernacular. It is to be observed in the first place, that the manufacture of leather was undoubtedly more extensively practised by the Gauls than by the Germanic tribes, as described by Tacitus. Secondly, the word is of ancient currency among the Celts, as is shown by its appearing in all the dialects, and in the earliest known compositions; for example, in the poems of Taliesin, believed to be of the sixth century. Moreover, there is strong evidence that it never was a *vernacular* Anglo-Saxon term. It scarcely ever appears as a distinct word, its occurrence being nearly confined to a few compound names of manufactured articles, for which Ælfric's glossary is almost the sole authority. Finally, it is important to observe that it is *significant* in Celtic, being derived from W. *lled*, G. *leathan*, broad, flat; while in the Germanic dialects it has no known etymology. Should all these considerations lead us to conclude that the Germans borrowed the word from the Celts, it is obvious to infer that the same process might take place with respect to many other terms of similar import.

The various speculations connected with general philology deducible from the subject which we have been considering, would lead us into too wide a field at present. Some of them may perhaps afford matter for a subsequent paper; it will be sufficient on this occasion to advert briefly to a single class of words, which appears to present some interesting phænomena.

Words with initial *gw* in Welsh or Breton generally correspond with the Sanscrit and German initial *w*, Latin *v*, Italian *gu*, French *g*, and Gaelic *f*: e. gr. W. *gwéu*, to weave; Sansc. *wē*; Bret. *gwasta*, to ravage; Lat. *vastare*; Ital. *guastare*; O. Fr. *gaster*; Eng. *waste*; Gael. *fàsaich*. Some words of this class deserve to be more particularly adverted to. It is well known that a number of vocables in the Teutonic dialects begin with *qu*, or some equivalent combination; and it is remarkable that a great proportion of them correspond to Cymric terms with initial *gw* or *cw*. The Mæso-Gothic, the oldest Germanic language, exhibits in its present state eleven leading words of this class, eight of which may be referred with great probability to Cymric or Armorican counterparts.

qvainon (or in Gabelentz's orthography, qainon, <i>to whine</i> ; Du. kwynen).....	} W. cwyno.
qairnus, <i>quern or hand-mill</i> ; in Holstein, quarr	} gwyraw, <i>to revolve</i> . (cf. North Frisic, querdel, <i>a weathercock</i> .)
qairrus, <i>placid, mild</i> ; Swed. qvar.	gwar, <i>id</i> .
gal (u. v. <i>subjugation</i>); A. S. cwaele, <i>destruction, &c.</i> ; cwellan, <i>to quell, kill</i>	} gwalla, <i>to injure, destroy</i> .
qens, <i>a woman</i>	gwen (<i>properly a fair one</i>), <i>female</i> .
qithan (O. Germ. quedan, <i>to say</i>)	gwedyd.

<i>qivs, alive (vivus)</i>	<i>gwio, Br., vivacious.</i>
<i>qistjan, to destroy</i>	<i>gwasta, Br., id.</i>

The three remaining terms *qiman*, to come, *qithus*, the womb, and *gramms*, wet (Dan. *klam*, Eng. *clammy*), may possibly be connected with W. *camu*, to step; *ceudawd*, the womb or inside; and *gwlyb*, moisture, Bret. *gleb*; but they do not manifest the strict parallelism of form which appears in the other words.

The following coincidences with Anglo-Saxon and the Low German dialects may also be noticed:—

<i>cwacian, to quake, A. S.</i>	<i>gwegiaw, to totter.</i>
<i>cwartern (custodiæ domus), prison</i>	<i>gwared, to guard.</i>
<i>cwanian, to pine, languish</i>	<i>gwàn, weak, feeble.</i>
<i>quad, Low Germ., bad</i>	<i>gwaeth, worse.</i>
<i>quaddern, to prate</i>	<i>chwedleua, id.</i>
<i>quarke, the throat</i>	<i>gwar, the neck.</i>
<i>quinka, to flutter, start</i>	<i>gwinka, Br., to wince.</i>
<i>quide, to complain (A. S. cwythan)</i>	<i>gwyth, wrath, indignation.</i>
<i>quasse, Prov. Dan., to squeeze</i> ..	<i>gwasga, id.</i>
<i>quakka, to croak, quack</i>	<i>gwacha, Br., to croak.</i>
<i>cuthe, A. S., known</i>	<i>gwydd, knowledge.</i>
<i>quaint (O. Fr. coint), smart,</i> <i>spruce, &c.; N. Yorksh., whent,</i> <i>strange</i>	<i>gwaint (Br. koant), neat, trim.</i>
<i>quip, sarcasm, &c.</i>	<i>gwih, sudden course; chwipyn,</i> <i>quick turn.</i>
<i>quibble, verbal evasion, &c.</i>	<i>gwibl, a turn, quirk.</i>
<i>quer, Germ. athwart</i>	<i>gwyr, oblique, awry.</i>
<i>quarl, Low Germ., pustule, blister</i>	<i>gwerbel, Bret., a tumour; cf.</i> <i>warble, a swelling in cattle</i> <i>caused by insects.</i>
<i>qwäll, Swed., evening</i>	<i>gwyll, darkness.</i>
<i>queelder, Du., low ground outside</i> <i>the dikes</i>	<i>gwaelawd, low ground, a bottom;</i> <i>gwaelder, lowness.</i>

The above and similar words may furnish a useful clue for tracing the origin of many French and Italian words commencing with *g* and *gu*. For example, the comparison of *galopper* and *gualoppare*, shows that *u* or *w* was an original portion of the word; and this directs us to W. *gwillobain*, literally to make quick jumps, an excellent analysis of the meaning of the term. The Scottish *wallop* is the same word with the loss of the guttural.

Many more coincidences might be produced, particularly from the Romance and provincial German dialects; but the above are sufficient to establish the analogy. Commonly the above initials correspond to a simple *w* in Sanscrit: for instance, *wad*, to speak, is the root agreeing with the W. *gwedyd*, and O. Germ. *quedan*; but sometimes a different characteristic appears: e. gr. *jiva* is the Sanscrit representative of Goth. *qivs*; *hansa* (goose) of Bret. *gwaz* and *harit* (green) of W. *gwerdd*. It may, therefore, be suspected that those

and similar words have emanated from primitive forms resembling the Celtic, and that the prototype of *harit*, for example, was more like W. *gwerdd* than the Latin *viridis*. Something analogous appears to have existed in some of the older German dialects; at least Paulus Diaconus assures us that Woden was called Gwoden by the Langobardi. The resemblance of the Langobardic form to the Gwydion of Welsh mythology is not unworthy of notice. O'Brien's etymology of Dia Ceadaoine, the Irish name of Wednesday, q. d. the day of Gwodan, is specious enough, but will not bear examination. It is merely cead, or ceud aoine, the *former fast*; Friday, simply called aoine, *the fast*, being regarded as the more considerable one.

The initial *chw* in Welsh words is in some cases a mere mutation of *gw*, but in general it corresponds to the Sanscrit and German *sw*, *swasri*, sister, W. *chwaer*; *swadu*, sweet, W. *chweg*; *swid*, to sweat, W. *chwysu*. The W. *chwech*, six, in conjunction with the remarkable Pushtoo *spash*, would imply that the Sanscrit *shash* was originally *swash*, or something like it. The Gaelic generally preserves the sibilant and drops the labial; e. gr. *sior*, sister, *sant*, desire (W. *chwant*), which again would suggest a suspicion that a similar process may have taken place with the Sanscrit *s'ans*, desiderare. A root *swans*, supposing it to have ever existed, would exactly harmonize with W. *chwant*, desire, *chwennych* to wish, according to the usual law of permutation. The Germanic dialects, it is well known, agree most faithfully with the Sanscrit in this combination. The Slavonic ones, including Lithuanian and Lettish, stand in the next degree of proximity, but occasionally manifest a disposition to drop the labial. The other cognate languages either substitute a guttural or an aspirate, harden the *w* into *p*, vocalize it, or drop it altogether, as will be rendered manifest by tracing the Sanscrit *swid*, to sweat, and *swid*, white, through their various affiliations. Pictet refers the Gaelic *speur*, sky, firmament, to Sanscrit *swar*; if it really is of that origin, and not, as there is room to suspect, a mere disfigurement of *sphæra*, it is a remarkable instance of the hard or Median form in a western dialect. *Piuthar*, G., sister, in which the sibilant appears to be dropt, seems to give some countenance to its genuineness. Compare W. *yspyddyn*, the white thorn; Armenian *spid*, white; Pers. *sipid*, &c., &c.

There are some remarkable coincidences between Welsh and Armorican words commencing with *gw*., and Sanscrit roots with initial *s'w* (*palatal s*), which it would exceed our present limits to discuss more particularly.

On Friday, February the 23rd, the following papers will be read:—

1. "On the Language of the Ancient Lycians." By Daniel Sharpe, Esq.

2. "On the Reformation of English Orthography." By D. Fry, Esq.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

FEBRUARY 9, 1844.

No. 17.

Professor KEY in the Chair.

The following works were laid on the table :—

The Numismatic Chronicle, No. 22. Presented by the Numismatic Society.

Dictionary of the English Language, by C. Richardson, Esq. Presented by the author.

The following paper was then read :—

“On the evidence of a connection between the Cimbri and the Chersonesus Cimbrica.” By Professor Latham.

It is considered that the evidence of any local connection between the Cimbri conquered by Marius, and the Chersonesus Cimbrica, is insufficient to counterbalance the natural improbability of a long and difficult national migration. Of such a connection, however, the identity of name and the concurrent belief of respectable writers are *prima facie* evidence. This, however, is disposed of if such a theory as the following can be established, viz. that, for certain reasons, the knowledge of the precise origin and locality of the nations conquered by Marius was, at an early period, confused and indefinite; that new countries were made known without giving any further information; that hence, the locality of the Cimbri was always pushed forwards beyond the limits of the geographical areas accurately ascertained; and finally, that thus their supposed locality retrograded continually northwards until it fixed in the districts of Sleswick and Jutland, where the barrier of the sea, and the increase of geographical knowledge (with one exception) prevented it from getting farther. Now this view arises out of the examination of the language of the historians and geographers as examined in order, from Sallust to Ptolemy.

Of Sallust and Cicero, the language points to Gaul as the home of the nation in question; and that without the least intimation of its being any particularly distant portion of that country. “Per idem tempus adversus Gallos ab ducibus nostris, Q. Cæpione et M. Manlio, malè pugnatum—Marius Consul absens factus, et ei decreta Provincia Gallia.” *Bell. Jugurth.* 114. “Ipse ille Marius—influentes in Italiam Gallorum maximas copias repressit.” *Cicero de Prov. Consul.* 13. And here an objection may be anticipated. It is undoubtedly true that even if the Cimbri had originated in a locality so distant as the Chersonese, it would have been almost impossible to have made such a fact accurately understood. Yet it

is also true, that if any material difference had existed between the Cimbri and the Gauls of Gaul, such must have been familiarly known in Rome, since slaves of both sorts must there have been common.

Cæsar, whose evidence ought to be conclusive (inasmuch as he knew of Germany as well as of Gaul), fixes them to the south of the Marne and Seine. This we learn, not from the direct text, but from inference: "Gallos—a Belgis Matrona et Sequana dividit." *Bell. Gall.* i. "Belgas—solos esse qui, patrum nostrum memoria, omni Galliâ vexatâ, Teutones Cimbrosque intra fines suos ingredi prohibuerunt." *Bell. Gall.* ii. 4. Now if the Teutones and Cimbri had moved from north to south, they would have clashed with the Belgæ first and with the other Gauls afterwards. The converse, however, was the fact. It is right here to state, that the last observation may be explained away by supposing, either that the Teutones and Cimbri here meant may be a *remnant* of the confederation on their *return*, or else a portion that settled down in Gaul upon their way; or finally, a division that made a circle towards the place of their destination in a south-east direction. None of these however seem the plain and natural construction; and I would rather, if reduced to the alternative, read "*Germania*" instead of "*Gallia*" than acquiesce in the most probable of them.

Diodorus Siculus, without defining their locality, deals throughout with the Cimbri as a Gaulish tribe. Besides this, he gives us one of the elements of the assumed indistinctness of ideas in regard to their origin, viz. their hypothetical connexion with the Cimmerii. In this recognition of what might have been called the *Cimmerian theory*, he is followed by Strabo and Plutarch.—*Diod. Sicul.* v. 32. *Strabo*, vii. *Plutarch. Vit. Marii*.

The next writer who mentions them is Strabo. In confirmation of the view taken above, this author places the Cimbri on the northernmost limit of the area geographically known to him, viz. *beyond* Gaul and *in* Germany, between the Rhine and the Elbe: τῶν δὲ Γερμάνων, ὡς εἶπον, οἱ μὲν προσάρκτιοι παρηκοῦσι τῷ Ὀκεανῷ. Γνωρίζονται δ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκβολῶν τοῦ Ῥήνου λάβοντες τὴν ἀρχὴν μέχρι τοῦ Ἀλβίου. Τούτων δὲ εἰσὶ γνωριμώτατοι Σούγαμβροί τε καὶ Κίμβροι. Τὰ δὲ πέραν τοῦ Ἀλβίου τὰ πρὸς τῷ Ὀκεανῷ παντάπασιν ἄγνωστα ἡμῖν ἐστίν. (B. iv.) Further proof that this was the frontier of the Roman world we get from the statement which soon follows, viz. that "thus much was known to the Romans from their successful wars, and that more would have been known had it not been for the injunction of Augustus forbidding his generals to cross the Elbe." (B. iv.)

Velleius Paterculus agrees with his contemporary Strabo. He places them beyond the Rhine, and deals with them as Germans:—"tum Cimbri et Teutoni transcendere Rhenum, multis mox nostris suisque cladibus nobiles." (ii. 9.) "Effusa—immanis vis Germanarum gentium quibus nomen Cimbris et Teutonis erat." (*Ibid.* 12.)

From the *Germania* of Tacitus a well-known passage will be considered in the sequel. Tacitus' locality coincides with that of Strabo.

Ptolemy.—Now the author who most mentions in detail the tribes

beyond the Elbe is also the author who most pushes back the Cimbri towards the north. Coincident with his improved information as to the parts southward, he places them at the extremity of the area known to him: Καῦχοι οἱ μείζονες μέχρι τοῦ Ἀλβίου ποταμοῦ· ἐφεξῆς δὲ ἐπὶ αὐχένα τῆς Κιμβρικῆς Χερσονήσου Σάξονες, αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Χερσονήσον· ὑπὲρ μὲν τοὺς Σάξονας, Σιγουλῶνες ἀπὸ δυσμῶν· εἴτα Σαβαλίγγοι, εἴτα Κόβανδοι, ὑπὲρ οὓς Χάλοι· καὶ ἔτι ὑπερτάτους δυσμικώτεροι μὲν Φουνδούσιοι, ἀνατολικώτεροι δὲ Χαρουῦδες, πάντων δὲ ἀρκτικώτεροι Κύμβροι.—*Ptolemæi Germania*.

Such is the evidence of those writers, Greek or Roman, who deal with the local habitation of the Cimbri rather than with the general history of that tribe. As a measure of the indefinitude of their ideas, we have the confusion, already noticed, between the Cimbri and Cimmerii, on the parts of Diodorus, Strabo, and Plutarch. A better measure occurs in the following extract from Pliny, who not only fixes the Cimbri in three places at once, but also (as far as we can find any meaning in his language) removes them so far northward as Norway: "Alterum genus Ingævones, quorum pars Cimbri Teutonicæ Chaucorum gentes. Proximi Rheno Istævones, quorum pars Cimbri mediterranei." (iv. 14.) "Promontorium Cimbrorum excurrans in maria longe Peninsulam efficit quæ Carthis appellatur." *Ibid*. "Sevo Mons (the mountain-chains of Norway) immanem ad Cimbrorum usque promontorium efficit sinum, qui Codanus vocatur, refertus insulis, quarum clarissima Scandinavia, incompertæ magnitudinis." (iv. 13.) Upon confusion like this it is not considered necessary to expend further evidence. So few statements coincide, that under all views there must be a misconception somewhere; and of such misconception great must the amount be, to become more improbable than a national migration from Jutland to Italy.

Over and above, however, this particular question of evidence, there stands a second one; viz. the determination of the ethnographical relations of the nations under consideration. This is the point as to whether the Cimbri conquered by Marius were Celts or Goths, akin to the Gauls, or akin to the Germans; a disputed point, and one which, for its own sake only, were worth discussing, even at the expense of raising a wholly independent question. Such however it is not. If the Cimbri were Celts, the improbability of their originating in the Cimbric Chersonese would be increased, and with it the amount of evidence required; since, laying aside other considerations, the natural unlikelihood of a large area being traversed by a mass of emigrants is greatly enhanced by the fact of any intermediate portion of that area being possessed by tribes as alien to each other as the Gauls and Germans. Hence therefore the fact of the Cimbri being Celts will (if proved) be considered as making against the probability of their origin in the Cimbric Chersonese; whilst if they be shown to be Goths, the difficulties of the supposition will be in some degree diminished. Whichever way this latter point is settled, something will be gained for the historian; since the supposed presence of Celts in the Cimbric Chersonese has complicated more than one question in ethnography.

Previous to proceeding in the inquiry it may be well to lay down once for all as a postulate, that whatever, in the way of ethnography, is proved concerning any one tribe of the Cimbro-Teutonic league, must be considered as proved concerning the remainder; since all explanations grounded upon the idea that one part was Gothic and another part Celtic have a certain amount of *prima facie* improbability to set aside. The same conditions as to the burden of proof apply also to any hypotheses founded on the notion of *retiring* Cimbri *posterior* to the attempted invasion of Italy. On this point the list of authors quoted will not be brought below the time of Ptolemy. With the testimonies anterior to that writer, bearing upon the question of the ethnography, the attempt however will be made to be exhaustive. Furthermore, as the question in hand is not so much the absolute fact as to whether the Cimbri were Celts or Goths, but one as to the amount of evidence upon which we believe them to be either the one or the other, statements will be noticed under the head of evidence, not because they are really proofs, but simply because they have ever been looked upon as such. Beginning then with the Germanic origin of the Cimbro-Teutonic confederation, and dealing separately with such tribes as are separately mentioned, we first find the

Ambrones.—In the Anglo-Saxon poem called the Traveller's Song, there is a notice of a tribe called *Ymbre*, *Ymbra*s, or *Ymbran*. Suhm, the historian of Denmark, has allowed himself to imagine that these represent the *Ambrones*, and that their name still exists in that of the island *Amron* of the coast of Sleswick, and perhaps in *Amerland*, a part of Oldenburg.—Thorpe's note on the Traveller's Song in the *Codex Eroniensis*.

Teutones.—In the way of evidence of there being Teutones amongst the Germans, over and above the associate mention of their names with that of the Cimbri, there is but little. They are not so mentioned either by Tacitus or Strabo. Ptolemy, however, mentions a) the Teutonarii, b) the Teutones: *Τευτονοάριοι καὶ Οὐίρουννοι*—*Φαραδεινῶν δὲ καὶ Συήβων, Τεύτορες καὶ Ἀμαρποι*. Besides this, however, arguments have been taken from a) the meaning of the root *teut*=*people* (*piuda*, M. G.; *peód*, A. S.; *diot*, O. H. G.): b) the *Saltus Teutobergius*: c) the supposed connection of the present word *Deut-sch*=*German* with the classical word *Teut-ones*. These may briefly be disposed of.

a.) It is not unlikely for an invading nation to call themselves *the nation, the nations, the people*, &c. Neither, if the tribe in question had done so (presuming them to have been Germans or Goths), would the word employed be very unlike *Teuton-es*. Although the word *piud-a*=*nation* or *people*, is generally strong in its declension (so making the plural *piud-ós*), it is found also in a weak form with its plural *thiot-ún*=*Teuton-*. See *Deutsche Grammatik*, i. 630.

b.) The *Saltus Teutobergius* mentioned by Tacitus (*Ann.* i. 60) can scarcely have taken its name from a tribe, or, on the other hand, have given it to one. It means either *the hill of the people*, or *the city of the people*; according as the syllable *-berg-* is derived from

bdirgs = a hill, or from *baúrgs* = a city. In either case the compound is allowable, e. g. *diot-wēc*, public way, O. H. G. ; *thiod-scatho*, robber of the people, O. S. ; *þéód-cýning*, *peod-mearc*, boundary of the nation, A. S. ; *þíód-land*, *þíód-vęgr*, people's way, Icelandic ;—*Theud-e-mirus*, *Theud-e-linda*, *Theud-i-gotha*, proper names (from *þiud*-) : *himil-bërac*, *velt-përac*, *friðu-përac*, O. H. G. ; *himinbiörg*, *valbiörg*, Icelandic (from *báirgs* = hill)—*ascipurc*, *hasalpurc*, *saltzpurc*, &c., O. H. G. (from *baúrgs* = city). The particular word *diot-purc* = *civitas magna* occurs in O. H. G.—See *Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. p. 478.

c.) Akin to this is the reasoning founded upon the connection (real or supposed) between the root *Teut-* in *Teuton-*, and the root *deut-* in *Deut-sch*. It runs thus. The syllable in question is common to the word *Teut-ones*, *Teut-onicus*, *Theod-iscus*, *teud-iscus*, *teut-iscus*, *tút-iske*, *dút-iske*, *tiut-sche*, *deut-sch* ; whilst the word *Deut-sch* means *German*. As the *Teut-ones* were Germans, so were the Cimbri also. Now this line of argument is set aside by the circumstance that the syllable *Teut-* in *Teut-ones* and *Teut-onicus*, as the names of the confederates of the Cimbri, is wholly unconnected with the *Teut-* in *theod-iscus*, and *Deut-sch*. This is fully shown by Grimm in his dissertation on the words *German* and *Dutch*. In its oldest form the latter word meant *popular*, *national*, *vernacular* ; it was an adjective applied to the *vulgar tongue*, or the vernacular German, in opposition to the Latin. In the tenth century the secondary form *Teut-onicus* came in vogue even with German writers. Whether this arose out of imitation of the Latin form *Romanice*, or out of the idea of an historical connection with the Teutones of the classics, is immaterial. It is clear that the present word *deut-sch* proves nothing respecting the *Teutones*. Perhaps, however, as early as the time of Martial the word *Teutonicus* was used in a general sense, denoting the Germans in general. Certain it is that before his time it meant the particular people conquered by Marius, irrespective of origin or locality.—See Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik*, i. p. 17, 3rd edit. Martial, xiv. 26, *Teutonicus capilli*. Claudian. in Eutrop. i. 406, *Teutonicum hostem*.

The *Cimbri*.—Evidence to the Gothic origin of the Cimbri (treated separately) begins with the writers under Augustus and Tiberius.

Vell. Paterculus.—The testimony of this writer as to the affinities of the nations in question is involved in his testimony as to their locality, and, consequently, subject to the same criticism. His mention of them (as Germans) is incidental.

Strabo.—Over and above the references already made, Strabo has certain specific statements concerning the Cimbri : a.) That according to a tradition (which he does not believe) they left their country on account of an inundation of the sea. This is applicable to Germany rather than to Gaul. This liability to inundations must not, however, be supposed to indicate a locality in the Cimbric Chersonese as well as a German origin, since the coast between the Scheldt and Elbe is as obnoxious to the ocean as the coasts of Holstein, Sleswick and Jutland. b.) That against the German Cimbri and Teutones the Belgæ alone kept their ground—ὥστε μόνους (Βέλγας)

ἀπτεύειν πρὸς τὴν τῶν Γερμάνων ἐφοδόν, Κίμβρων καὶ Τευτόνων (iv. 3.) This is merely a translation of Cæsar (see above) with the interpolation Γερμάνων. c.) That they inhabited their original country, and that they sent ambassadors to Augustus—καὶ γὰρ νῦν ἔχουσι τὴν χώραν ἣν εἶχον πρότερον, καὶ ἐπεμψαν τῷ Σεβαστῷ δῶρον τὸν ἱερώτατον παρ' αὐτοῖς, λέβητα, αἰτούμενοι φιλίαν καὶ ἀμνηστίαν τῶν ὑπουργμένων· τύχοντες δὲ ὧν ἡξίουσιν ἀφῆραν. (B. i.) Full weight must be given to the definite character of this statement.

Tacitus.—Tacitus coincides with Strabo, in giving to the Cimbri a specific locality, and in stating special circumstances of their history. Let full weight be given to the words of a writer like Tacitus; but let it also be remembered that he wrote from hearsay evidence, that he is anything rather than an independent witness, that his statement is scarcely reconcileable with those of Ptolemy and Cæsar, and that above all the locality which both he and Strabo give the *Cimbri* is also the locality of the *Sicambri*, of which latter tribe no mention is made by Tacitus, although their wars with the Romans were matters of comparatively recent history. For my own part, I think, that between a confusion of the *Cimbri* with the *Cimmerii* on the one hand, and of the *Cimbri* with the *Sicambri* on the other, we have the clue to the misconceptions assumed at the commencement of the paper. There is no proof that in the eyes of the writers under the Republic, the origin of the Cimbri was a matter of either doubt or speculation. Catulus, in the History of his Consulship, commended by Cicero (*Brutus*, xxxv.), and Sylla in his Commentaries, must have spoken of them in a straightforward manner as Gauls, otherwise Cicero and Sallust would have spoken of them less decidedly. (See Plutarch's *Life of Marius* and *note*.) Confusion arose when Greek readers of Homer and Herodotus began to theorize, and this grew greater when formidable enemies under the name of *Sicambri* were found in Germany. It is highly probable that in both Strabo and Tacitus we have a commentary on the lines of Horace—

Te cæde gaudentes Sicambri
Compositis venerantur armis.

"Eundem (with the Chauci, Catti, and Cherusci) Germaniæ sinum proximi Oceano Cimbri tenent, parva nunc civitas, sed gloria ingens: veterisque famæ lata vestigia manent, utrâque ripâ castra ac spatia, quorum ambitu nunc quoque metiaris molem manusque gentis, et tam magni exitûs fidem—occasione discordiæ nostræ et civilium armorum, expugnatis legionum hibernis, etiam Gallias affectavêre; ac rursus pulsi, inde proximis temporibus triumphati magis quam victi sunt." (*German.* 38.)

Justin.—Justin writes—"Simul e Germaniâ Cimbros—inundâsse Italiam." Now this extract would be valuable if we were sure that the word *Germania* came from Justin's original, Trogus Pompeius; who was a Vocontian Gaul, living soon after the Cimbric defeat. To him, however, the term *Germania* must have been wholly unknown; since, besides general reasons, Tacitus says—"Germaniæ vocabulum

recens et nuper additum: quoniam, qui primum Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint, ac nunc Tungri, tunc Germani vocati sint: ita nationis nomen, non gentis, evaluisse paullatim, ut omnes, primum a victore ob metum, mox a seipsis invento nomine *Germani* vocarentur." Justin's interpolation of *Germani* corresponds with the similar one on the part of Strabo.

Such is the evidence for the Germanic origin of the Cimbri and Teutones, against which may now be set the following testimonies as to their affinity with the Celts, each tribe being dealt with separately.

The Ambrones.—Strabo mentions them along with the Tigurini, an undoubted Celtic tribe—*Κατὰ τὸν πρὸς Ἀμβρωνας καὶ Τωῦγενούς πόλεμον.*

Suetonius places them with the Transpadani—"per Ambronas et Transpadanos." (*Cæsar*, § 9.)

Plutarch mentions that their war-cries were understood and answered by the Ligurians. Now it is possible that the Ligurians were Celts, whilst it is certain that they were not Goths.

The Teutones.—Appian speaks of the Teutones having invaded Noricum, and this under the head *Κέλτικα*.

Florus calls one of the kings of the Teutones Teutobocchus, a name Celtic rather than Gothic.

Virgil has the following lines:—

..... late jam tum ditioe premebat
Sarrastes populos, et quæ rigat æquora Sarnus;
Quique Rufas, Batulumque tenent, atque arva Celenhæ;
Et quos maliferæ despectant mœnia Abellæ:
Teutonico ritu soliti torquere *cateias*.
Tegmina queis caput raptus de subere cortex,
Ærataeque micant peltæ, micat æreus ensis.—*Æn.* vii. 737–743.

Now this word *cateia* may be a provincialism from the neighbourhood of Sarraste. It may also (amongst other things) be a true Teutonic word. From what follows it will appear that this latter view is at least as likely as any other. The commentators state that it is *vox Celtica*. That this is true may be seen from the following forms—Irish: *ga*, spear, javelin; *gaoth*, ditto, a dart; *goth*, a spear (O'Reilly); *gaothadh*, a javelin; *gadh*, spear; *gai*, ditto; *crann gaidh*, spear-shaft (Begly)—Cornish: *geu*, *gew*, *gu*, *gui*=lance, spear, javelin, shaft (Pryce)—Breton: *goas*, *goaff* (Rostremer).

Considering the peculiarities of the Celtic pronunciation, this word *cateia* is perhaps the *gas-um* of another part of Virgil, and the *ἰσσο*-os of Appian, as well as the English word *goad*.

The Cimbri—The Teutones.—Of either the Cimbri separately or of the Cimbri and Teutones collectively, being of Gallic origin, we have, in the way of direct evidence, the testimonies exhibited above, viz. of Sallust, Cicero, Cæsar, Diodorus. To this may be added that of Dion Cassius, who not only had access to the contemporary accounts which spoke of them as Gauls, but also was enabled to use

them critically, being possessed of information concerning Germany as well as France.

Of Appian the whole evidence goes one way, viz. that the tribes in question were Gauls. His expressions are: *πλεῖστον τι καὶ μαχίμωτατον—χρῆμα Κελτῶν εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλατίαν εἰσέβαλε.* (iv. 2.) In his book on Illyria he states that the Celts and Cimbri, along with the Illyrian tribe of the Autariæ, had, previous to the battle against Marius, attacked Delphi and suffered for their impiety. (*Ἰλλυρ. δ. 4.*)

Quintilian may be considered to give us upon the subject the notions of two writers—Virgil, and either Cæsar or Crassus. In dealing, however, with the words of Quintilian, it will be seen that there are two assumptions. That either Cæsar or Crassus considered the Cimbri to be Gauls we infer from the following passage:—“*Rarum est autem, ut oculis subicere contingat (sc. vituperationem), ut fecit C. Julius, qui cum Helvio Manciæ sæpius obstrepenti sibi diceret, jam ostendam, qualis sis: isque plane instaret interrogatione, qualem se tandem ostensurus esset, digito demonstravit imaginem Galli in scuto Mariano Cimbrico pictam, cui Mancia tum simillimus est visus. Tabernæ autem erant circum Forum, ac scutum illud signi gratiâ positum.*” *Inst. Orat. vi. 3. 38.* Pliny tells the story of Crassus (39. 4.). Although in this passage the word upon which the argument turns has been written *galli*, and translated *cock*, the current interpretation is the one given above.—*Vid. not. ed. Gesner.*

In the same author is preserved the epigram of Virgil’s called *Catalecta*, and commented on by Ausonius of Bordeaux. Here we learn that T. Annius *Cimber* was a Gaul; whilst it is assumed that there was no other reason to believe that he was called *Cimber* than that of being descended from some slave or freedman of that nation:—“*Non appareat affectatio, in quam mirifice Virgilius,*

*Corinthiorum amator iste verborum,
Ille iste rhetor: namque quatenus totus
Thucydides Britannus, Atticæ febres,
Tau-Gallicum, min-, al- spinæ male illisit.
Ita omnia ista verba miscuit fratri.*

Cimber hic fuit a quo fratrem necatum hoc Ciceronis dictum notatum est; Germanum Cimber occidit.”—*Inst. Orat. viii. 3. cum not.*

*Dic, quid significant Catalecta Maronis? in his al-
Celtarum posuit, sequitur non lucidum tau-,
Et quod germano mistum male letiferum min-.—Auson.*

Undoubtedly the pronunciation here ridiculed is that of the Gauls, and it is just possible that in it is foreshadowed the curtailed form that the Latin tongue in general puts on in the present French. Again, the slave whose courage failed him when ordered to slay Caius Marius is called both a Gaul and a Cimbrian by Plutarch, as well as by Lucan. In the latter writer we have probably but a piece of rhetoric. (*Pharsalia*, lib. ii.)

Amongst tribes undoubtedly Gallic the Nervii claimed descent from the Teutones and Cimbri. The passage of Tacitus that connects the Nervii with the *Germans* connects them also with the Treveri. Now a well-known passage in St. Jerome tells us that the Treveri were Gauls:—*Νέρβιοι ἦσαν δὲ Κίμβρων καὶ Τευτόνων ἀπόγονοι.*—*Appian*, iv. 1. 4. “Treveri et Nervii circa adfectionem Germanicæ originis ultrò ambitiosi sunt, tamquam, per hanc gloriam sanguinis, a similitudine et inertia Gallorum separentur.” *German.* 28. Finally, in the Life of Marius by Plutarch we have dialogues between the Cimbri and the Romans. Now a Gallic interpreter was probable, but not so a German one.

Such are the notices bearing upon the ethnography of the Cimbri. Others occur, especially amongst the poets; of these little or no use can be made, for a reason indicated above. Justin speaks of embassies between Mithridates and the Cimbri. Suetonius connects the Cimbri with the Gallic Senones; he is writing however about Germany, so that his evidence, slight as it is, is neutralized. Theories grounded upon the national name may be raised on both sides; *Cimbri* may coincide with either the Germanic *kempa* = *a warrior* or *champion*, or with the Celtic *Cymry* = *Cambrians*. Equally equivocal seem the arguments drawn from the descriptions either of their physical conformation or their manners. The silence of the Gothic traditions as to the Cimbri being Germanic, proves more in the way of negative evidence than the similar silence of the Celtic ones, since the Gothic legends are the most numerous and the most ancient. Besides this, they deal very especially with genealogies, national and individual. The name of Bojorix, a Cimbric king mentioned in *Epitome Liviana* (lxvii.), is Celtic rather than Gothic, although in the latter dialects proper names ending in *-ric*, (*Alaric*, *Genseric*) frequently occur.

Measuring the evidence, which is in its character essentially cumulative, consisting of a number of details unimportant in themselves, but of value when taken in the mass, the balance seems to be in favour of the Cimbri, Teutones and Ambrones being Gauls rather than Germans, Celts rather than Goths.

An argument now forthcoming stands alone, inasmuch as it seems to prove two things at once, viz. not only the Celtic origin of the Cimbri, but, at the same time, their locality in the Chersonese. It is brought forward by Dr. Pritchard in his ‘Physical History of Mankind,’ and runs as follows:—(a.) It is a statement of Pliny that the sea in their neighbourhood was called by the Cimbri *Morimarusa*, or the *dead sea* = *mare mortuum*. (b.) It is a fact that in Celtic Welsh *mor marwth* = *mare mortuum*, *morimarusa*, *dead sea*. Hence the language of the Cimbric coast is to be considered as Celtic. Now the following facts invalidate this conclusion:—(1.) Putting aside the contradictions in Pliny’s statement, the epithet *dead* is inapplicable to either the German Ocean or the Baltic. (2.) Pliny’s authority was a writer named Philemon: out of the numerous Philemons enumerated by Fabricius, it is likely that the one here adduced was a contemporary of Alexander the Great; and it is not

probable that at that time glosses from the Baltic were known in the Mediterranean. (3.) The subject upon which this Philemon wrote was the Homeric Poems. This, taken along with the geography of the time, makes it highly probable that the original Greek was not *Κίμβροι*, but *Κιμμέριοι*; indeed we are not absolutely sure of Pliny having written *Cimbri*. (4.) As applied to Cimmerian sea the epithet *dead* was applicable. (5.) The term *Morimarusa* = *mare mortuum*, although good Celtic, is better Slavonic, since throughout that stock of languages, as in many other of the Indo-European tongues (the Celtic and Latin included), the roots *mor* and *mori* mean *sea* and *dead* respectively:—"Septentrionalis Oceanus, Amalchium eum Hecatæus appellat, a Paropamiso amne, qua Scythiam alluit, quod nomen ejus gentis linguâ significat congelatum, Philemon *Morimarusam* a Cimbris (qu. *Cimmeriis*) vocari scribit: hoc est *mare mortuum* usque ad promontorium Rubeas, ultra deinde *Cronium*." (13.)

One point, however, still remains: it may be dealt with briefly, but it should not be wholly overlooked, viz. the question, whether over and above the theories as to the location of the Cimbri in the Cimbric Chersonese, there is reason to believe, on independent grounds, that Celtic tribes were the early inhabitants of the peninsula in question? If such were actually the case, all that has preceded would, up to a certain point, be invalidated. Now I know no sufficient reasons for believing such to be the case, although there are current in ethnography many insufficient ones.

1. In the way of Philology, it is undoubtedly true that words common to the Celtic tribes occur in the Danish of Jutland, and in the Frisian and Low German of Sleswick and Holstein; but there is no reason to consider that they belong to an aboriginal Celtic tribe. The *à priori* probability of Celts in the peninsula involves hypotheses in ethnography which are, to say the least, far from being generally recognized. The evidence as to the language of aborigines derived from the significance of the names of old geographical localities is wanting for the Cimbric Chersonese. The arguments as to the origin from Jutland of certain Celtic tribes in England (*e. g.* the Picts) either rest upon the historical evidence that has just been discussed, or else involve a vicious circle of argument.

2. No traditions, either Scandinavian or German, point towards an aboriginal Celtic population for the localities in question.

3. There are no satisfactory proofs of such in either Archæology or Natural History. A paper noticed by Dr. Pritchard of Professor Eschricht's upon certain Tumuli in Jutland, states, that the earliest specimens of art (anterior to the discovery of metals), as well as the character of the tumuli themselves, have a Celtic character. He adds, however, that the character of the tumuli is as much Siberian as Celtic. The early specimens of art are undoubtedly like similar specimens found in England. It happens, however, that such things are in *all* countries more or less alike. In Professor Siebold's museum at Leyden, stone-axes from tumuli in Japan and Jutland are laid side by side, for the sake of comparison, and between them

there is no perceptible difference. The oldest skulls in these tumuli are said to be other than Gothic. They are, however, Finnic rather than Celtic.

4. The statement in Tacitus (*Germ.* 44.), that a nation on the Baltic called the *Æstii* spoke a language somewhat akin to the British, cannot be considered as conclusive to the existence of Celts in the North of Germany. Any language, not German, would probably so be denoted. Such might exist in the mother-tongue of either the Lithuanic or the Esthonian.

It is considered that in the foregoing pages the following propositions are either proved or involved :—1. That the Cimbri conquered by Marius came from either Gaul or Switzerland, and that they were Celts. 2. That the Teutones and Ambrones were equally Celtic with the Cimbri. 3. That no nation north of the Elbe was known to Republican Rome. 4. That there is no evidence of Celtic tribes ever having existed north of the Elbe. 5. That the epithet *Cimbrica* applied to the Chersonesus proves nothing more in respect to the inhabitants of that locality than is proved by words like *West Indian* and *North-American Indian*. 6. That in the word *cateia* we are in possession of a new Celtic gloss. 7. That in the term *Morimarusa* we are in possession of a gloss at once Cimmerian and Slavonic. 8. That for any positive theory as to the Cimbri-Teutonic league we have at present no data, but that the hypothesis that would reconcile the greatest variety of statements would run thus : viz. that an organized Celtic confederation conterminous with the Belgæ, the Ligurians, and the Helvetians descended with its eastern divisions upon Noricum, and with its western ones upon Provence.

In the discussion which arose upon the reading of the above paper, it was observed that *Teutones* was not necessarily a Germanic appellation; the supposed root of the word being found in the same as well as other significations, in the various Celtic dialects. The Irish *tuath*, for example, means both *people* and *north*. It was also suggested that *cateia* might possibly be connected with *W. cad*, battle. *Cadwayw* literally means war-spear or lance.

On Friday, March 8, will be read a paper "On the Ellipsis and on the Pleonastic use of the Pronoun Personal in English Syntax." By Edwin Guest, Esq.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

FEBRUARY 23, 1844.

No. 18.

J. M. KEMBLE, Esq., in the Chair.

The following gentlemen were elected members of the Society :—

Rev. H. Dupuis, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and Assistant Master, Eton.

Rev. A. Mills, Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge.

Two communications were then read :—

1. "On certain Lycian Inscriptions copied by the Rev. E. T. Daniell, Edward Forbes, Esq. and Lieut. Spratt, R.N." By Daniel Sharpe, Esq.

The inscriptions which form the subject of the present paper were copied in Lycia by Mr. Forbes, Lieutenant Spratt, and the late Rev. E. T. Daniell, and it was the intention of the latter to have published them had he returned to England. The memorandum-books containing them were sent, in compliance with Mr. Daniell's last wishes, to Mr. Forbes and Lieut. Spratt, and were placed at the disposal of the author by these gentlemen.

The inscriptions have been copied without alteration from the original books. The greater part of them are entirely new, but some have been added, although published before by Mr. Fellows, because the present copies appear to be more correct than the former ones. Fresh copies of other inscriptions already published might have been added, but as the differences in the versions are slight they are omitted. There are also two new inscriptions copied by Mr. Fellows, Nos. 10 and 19.

In the version of the inscriptions given in the text, an endeavour has been made to restore the true reading as far as practicable. This is easier than might be expected, owing to the frequent recurrence of the same words and phrases in different inscriptions, which being funereal have a great sameness of expression; and it is by taking advantage of the repetition of similar sentences differently modified, that the author arrives at the translations which have been given of some portions. The bilingual inscriptions furnish the meanings of a certain number of Lycian words: where several of these are found in another sentence in company with only one or two others, the context usually gives a probable meaning for the new words; this probability is increased every time that the meaning so acquired gives a consistent sense to a fresh sentence, and it becomes almost a certainty if it produces a rational translation in every instance. This method is strictly analogous to that followed in reading an unknown cypher, where the accuracy of the decypherer is estimated by the harmony of the result which he produces.

The Greek funereal inscriptions, which abound in Lycia, frequently give an indirect assistance towards understanding those in the earlier language. They run in certain set phrases, which we

naturally look for and frequently find in the Lycian inscriptions. The change of language in Lycia appears to have been gradual, and the alteration in manners to have been equally slow.

Before entering upon the inscriptions, it will be necessary to say a few words on the alphabet, as both corrections and additions must be made to the details which have already been laid before the public.

In his memoir on the Lycian inscriptions, inserted in the fourth volume of the 'Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes,' Professor Grotefend proposes a reading for the Lycian vowels widely differing from that which the author had adopted, and in which, with the exception of one alteration, he cannot agree. The learned professor has been misled by the bilingual inscription from Antiphellos, which is incomplete in our copies. Not observing that it wants the end of each of the first lines, he has tried to find the Lycian corresponding to *Iktaσλα* (the owner of the tomb) in the name of that person's father, and to bring these names together, he has changed the value of several of the Lycian letters. But all the reasoning built upon this foundation falls to the ground when it is shown that the name corresponding to *Iktasla* is lost at the end of the first line of the inscription.

The correction proposed by the professor, in which the author concurs, consists in regarding **BB** as equivalent to the Greek **Ω**, which materially simplifies the alphabet. We may carry this farther, and consider **ⱭⱭ** as also equivalent to **Ω**. The difference between these letters when single is so slight as not easily to be appreciated, but when doubled they are constantly interchanged.

The author had been led into the error of considering **+** as nearly equivalent to the two last-mentioned letters by Mr. Fellows's version of the bilingual inscription at Limyra, but the present more correct copy destroys the source of the mistake.

The principal difficulty in the Lycian alphabet still consists in the letters related to *U*, which, without being identical, express modifications of sound too numerous for us to appreciate. Disregarding variations in form, which may be attributed to the whims of the sculptors, there are five distinct letters, two of which are also used double, making seven changes, which it is difficult to express by more than five, *u*, *ũ*, *ū*, *w*, and *ō*. It is probable that they represented a greater number of sounds than these, but we cannot hope to distinguish them more accurately until we know the relative dates of the different Lycian monuments; as we have inscriptions extending over a long period, during which the language was undergoing considerable changes, from which these letters suffered more than any others. The following is the explanation offered of them:—

W and **V** are so near each other that it is difficult to distinguish between them, although they are not absolutely identical, and we are forced to regard both as *U* short. Of the two, the first is probably the shorter in sound*. In all the common words in which either of these letters occurs, there seems a preference for one or the other of them; yet in every word they are occasionally interchanged.

* It has been distinguished by a mark *ũ*, the other being represented by *u* without any distinguishing sign.

+ is U long, and also V, if that consonant is to be recognised at all. **B** and **ꝥ** are W, usually consonants, but occasionally long vowels. In some words the one letter is invariably used, in others they are interchanged.

BB and **ꝥꝥ** seem exact equivalents to the Greek Ω , and when so doubled appear identical.

In two inscriptions, Nos. 26 and 31, the letter **ꝥ** is used instead of **W** in the word *ēwūnu*. If the copies are correct, this shows great affinity between the letters; but two instances, set against all other cases, will not prove their identity. Unfortunately the copies of both inscriptions are faulty and imperfect, so that we cannot rely upon them.

The author must add two letters to the alphabet, which are both of rare occurrence, and were overlooked before. **Y** is found on each side of the great obelisk at Xanthus, less than twenty times in all, and in less than ten distinct words. It is doubtful if it occurs in any other inscription, as in the few cases in which we find it, it seems to be an imperfect copy of some other letter. It is also found on two coins, Nos. 8 and 11, of Mr. Fellows's Plate 37, both of which are of great antiquity. No. 8 is badly engraved; its legend is probably **Y↑PEYA**, which occurs several times on the obelisk, viz. S.W.5,25?, N.W.45,53?, N.E.38,50? The author's former reference of this coin to *Gagæ* cannot stand, but it is difficult to say to what town it should be referred. A letter of similar form to this has been found in several alphabets, and has been variously explained. It is found in Phrygian inscriptions, on coins of Cilicia, and on Phœnician coins and inscriptions. In the latter Gesenius calls it *Zade*, and its power is perhaps not very far from the English pronunciation of J.

W occurs eight times on the north-east and north-west sides of the Xanthus obelisk, and is not found elsewhere. With so little to guide us, there is no hope of fixing its value; but looking for assistance to the same source as in the last instance, we find in Gesenius a Phœnician letter with a considerable resemblance in form, which that author regards as *Samech*, a sibilant of which the exact sound is still a matter of some doubt.

It is remarkable that these two letters should be found in one inscription at Xanthus, and not on any other of the numerous monuments of which we have the records before us; and three hypotheses present themselves in explanation of this extraordinary fact:—1st, that these two letters are foreign to the language, and only used in the names of foreign towns and persons; 2nd, that the Xanthus inscription is in the dialect of a different tribe from the other inscriptions; 3rd, that it is of a different date from the other inscriptions, and that the language changed somewhat in the interval.

The first conjecture is negatived as regards one of the letters by its occurrence on coins of the true Lycian type; and it thus becomes improbable of the other letter. The second supposition is improbable, because this obelisk is in the same town as many other inscriptions, and it contains many words which are found in the other

inscriptions. The last seems the most probable explanation. We know that Greek civilization was gradually making way in Asia Minor before the Macedonian conquest, and Mr. Fellows's researches show us that Greek art gradually drove the Asiatic style of sculpture out of Lycia. We have also evidence in these inscriptions that the Lycian language underwent considerable changes, even in its common forms of declension; before it was finally supplanted by the all-conquering Greek. We may therefore be disposed to consider all marked variations of dialect as evidences of difference of date; and if this is allowed, the Xanthus inscription must be regarded as the earliest yet brought from Lycia.

The following table represents the Lycian alphabet:—

Common Forms.	Value.
A A	<i>ā long</i>
X	<i>ă short</i>
↑	<i>ē long</i>
E	<i>ě short</i>
I	<i>ī long, or y</i>
⌘	<i>ĩ short</i>
▼ ▼	<i>u</i>
W	<i>ũ short</i>
+	<i>ū long, and perhaps v</i>
O	<i>ō short</i>
B }	<i>w consonant or vowel</i>
⌘ }	
B B }	<i>ō long</i>
⌘ ⌘ }	
V	<i>G</i>
Δ	<i>D</i>
⌘	<i>Z</i>
K	<i>K</i>
Λ	<i>L</i>
M M	<i>M</i>
N	<i>N</i>
Γ Λ	<i>P</i>
P	<i>R</i>
S	<i>S</i>
T	<i>T</i>
F	<i>F</i>
⌘	<i>Ch</i>
Y	<i>J probably</i>
W	<i>Unknown</i>
⌘ : ⌘ :	<i>Stops</i>
III . O— . III— . . .	<i>Numerals</i>

The inscriptions are placed in the order in which the language may be most easily studied, beginning with those which have a Greek translation accompanying them. Those are next taken in which the construction is the simplest and the number of words already known predominates; the rest are placed so that the difficulties may be presented to view step by step.

No. 1. *Bilingual Inscription at Limyra.*

Of this two copies have been published; the first was made by Mr. Cockerell, and is given in Mr. Walpole's Travels, the other was published by Mr. Fellows. The present copy has been made with great care, and is nearly complete, so that with the exception of the names it may be restored without any risk; it confirms many of the corrections which had been previously suggested by the author. The letter + is twice omitted in the third line, at the termination of the genitive name, and at the beginning of the word *ūrppe*. The Greek translation is so literal, that this short inscription is of great importance, and the present copy is a valuable addition to our stock; but as the author has analysed it at great length before, he merely gives the restoration and translation of it:—

ēwēeya :	ērafazeya :	mēte	prinafatū :	sedēreya :	pē . . . nēū :
το	μνημα	τοδε	εποιησατο	Σιδαριος	Παρμενοντος
<i>This</i>	<i>tomb</i>	<i>which</i>	<i>made</i>	<i>Sidarios</i>	<i>Parmeno's</i>

tedēeme :	ūrppe	ētle	ēūwe	sē	lade :	ēūwe	sē	tedēeme
υιος		εαυτω	και	τη	γυναικι	και	υιω	
<i>son</i>	<i>for</i>	<i>himself</i>	<i>and</i>	<i>wife</i>	<i>his</i>	<i>and</i>	<i>son</i>	

p . . . ē . . . lēyē
 Πυβιαλη
Pubiale.

No. 2. *Bilingual Inscription at Levis.*

This was copied by Mr. Daniell and given by him to Mr. Fellows, from whom the author received it. It is not in Mr. Daniell's memorandum-book, nor does it appear to have been copied by any other person. The inscription is nearly perfect, and forms a most important addition to our knowledge of the language.

There appear to have been two flaws in the stone, of less width than at present, before the letters were cut; for the spaces are much greater than is required for the missing letters. The same circumstance occurs in several other inscriptions. Where the defects in the stone prevented the artists from getting an even surface, they appear to have left blank spaces and continued the lines further on.

The following is the best version of the inscription which presents itself:—

ēwūinū	itatu	mēnē	prinafutū	polēnīda	molleūēsēū	sē
τουτο το	μνημα		εργασαντο	Απολωνιδης	Μολλυσιος	και
<i>This</i>	<i>tomb</i>	<i>which</i>	<i>made</i>	<i>Apollonides</i>	<i>son of Mollisus</i>	<i>and</i>

<i>lapara</i>	<i>polēnīdaū</i>	<i>poreūemētēū</i>	<i>prinēzeyēūe</i>	<i>ūrpe</i>		
Λαπαρας	Απολλωνιδου	Πυριματιος	οικειοι	επι	ταις	
<i>Laparas son of Apollonides</i>	<i>Porimatis's</i>	<i>servants</i>	<i>for</i>			
<i>lada</i>	<i>ēpttēūē</i>	<i>sē</i>	<i>tedēemē</i>	<i>sē</i>	<i>ey</i>	<i>ē</i>
γυναιξιν	ταις εαυτων	και	τοις εγγονοις	και	αν	τις
<i>wives</i>	<i>their</i>	<i>and</i>	<i>children</i>	<i>and</i>	<i>if</i>	<i>anyone</i>
<i>tesē reti . . deteē</i>	<i>itatu</i>	<i>ēwēūe</i>	<i>mē ey ē</i>	<i>oēte</i>	<i>ponamachche :</i>	
αδικηση	το μνημα	τουτο	εξωλεα	και	πανωλεα	ειη
<i>violates</i>	<i>tomb</i>	<i>this</i>				
<i>aladaūade</i>	<i>:</i>	<i>ada</i>	<i>:</i>	<i>4</i>		
αυτω	παντων					
<i>let him pay a fine</i>	<i>adas . . .</i>					

In the first paragraph the Greek and Lycian correspond almost word for word, but in the conclusion they differ entirely; the Greek version denounces curses upon the violator of the tomb, while the Lycian threatens him with a fine. This will be better seen in analysing the whole in detail.

ēwūinū, the neuter of the demonstrative *this*.

itatu, a *tomb* or *monument*, in the Greek *μνημα*. It is apparently the passive participle of a verb signifying *to bury*, of which there are several tenses used in other inscriptions (see the Appendix to Mr. Fellows's *Lycia*, p. 482). The author at first thought the initial short vowel the augment, and connected the verb with *τιθημι*; but as the same vowel occurs in the participle, it is probably part of the form of the verb. Professor Grotefend gave another turn to the sentences in which the verb *itatu*, &c. occurs, by translating it *transgress*; but the inscription before us proves that the true translation is *to bury*.

mēnē, a declinable demonstrative participle.

prinafutū, in the Greek *εργασαντο*, *they made*, or *caused to be made*, if the Lycian verbs had a middle voice. This is the first instance in which we are sure of having a verb in the plural; it is therefore very unfortunate that there is a flaw, which makes its termination uncertain. The same tense in the singular is of frequent occurrence, written *prinafatū*.

Polēnīda, in the genitive *Polēnīdaū*; in the Greek *Απολλωνιδης*. There are several peculiarities of Lycian orthography shown in the changes which this name undergoes in its translation from the Greek. Both the initial vowel and the terminal consonant are dropped in the Lycian, in which language a great majority of the names begin with a consonant, and all without exception end in a vowel. There is also a remarkable change of the *ω* into *ē* in the middle of the word. Strabo gives an instance of an analogous change in the Asiatic name of *Νωρα*, which he says is now called *Νηροασσος*. In addition to this, one *l* is omitted, and the name is so changed, that if we had not the Greek form in the same inscription, we should never have suspected the connexion between them.

Molleūēsēū, in the Greek *Μολλισιος*. In changing this name into Lycian, the short second syllable is drawn out into two long syl-

lables, an alteration similar to that which we find in the same inscription in the name *Porimatis*.

Dapafa is the next name, if we trust the Lycian version, but the Greek has it *Λαπαρας*. There is very little reason for preferring either *L* or *D* at the beginning of the word, but the *f* in the last syllable must be wrongly copied for *r*; the name must be either *Dapara* or *Lapara*. Here again the Lycian drops the terminal consonant.

Poreūemētēū. There is a gap in the latter part of this word, which may only be owing to a flaw in the stone, or there may have been another syllable in the word. The Greek form *Ποριματιος* makes it appear complete, but on the inscription No. 7 we find the nominative name *Poreūemētete*, and in No. 26, which is too imperfect to be of much assistance, *Poreūemēewa*. In one of the unpublished Greek inscriptions from Limyra we find mention of *κυριον Ποριματιν*; it is not likely that all these inscriptions relate to the same person; probably the name *Porimatis* reoccurs in several generations of one of the leading families of the country. The second syllable of the Greek name is drawn out into two syllables in the Lycian, in a manner analogous to the instance already pointed out with *Μολλισιος*. The letter *ē* which follows this name is omitted, being apparently copied instead of the usual stops.

prinēzeyēūe. This word has been restored from another inscription in which it occurs, the No. 9 of Mr. Fellows's Plate 36. The dative singular *prinēze* occurs several times. The author formerly translated this word *beloved*, relying on the context; but its meaning is now ascertained by the Greek translation *οικειοι*, *domestic servants*; perhaps in this instance *stewards*. In several of the Greek funereal inscriptions copied by Mr. Daniell the *οικειοι* are mentioned, or tombs are stated to be built for them by their masters; but it is a proof of the importance of the Lord *Porimatis*, that his servants provided themselves with a tomb of this order.

ūrppe, the preposition *for*, in the Greek *επι*. This word is nearly lost in the crack across the stone; but as it occurs in almost every inscription, there is no danger in restoring it.

lada, the dative plural *wives*, in the Greek *γυναιξιν*. The dative singular *lade* occurs frequently. In No. 5, Plate 36, of Mr. Fellows, the nominative singular is *lada*; in No. 13 the dative singular is *ladu*; and in No. 18 *ladue* is the dative plural. These variations of termination make one suspect that the language has an instrumental case as well as a dative.

ēpttēūē, the Greek *ταῖς εαυτῶν*. This appears to be a close translation; the word is the genitive plural of *themselves*. We have the genitive singular *ēpttēūe* in the upper inscription at p. 225 of Mr. Fellows's 'Asia Minor;' and in plate 36, No. 5, of his 'Lycia,' we have another form of the word, *ēpttē*. That inscription is very imperfect, and Mr. Daniell's copy of it does not enable us to read it with any certainty, but it probably runs *ūrppe atla ēppte*, *for themselves*; the latter word being used adjectively, the phrase will thus be analogous to the common form *ūrppe atle ēūwe*, *for himself*. The nominative singular is probably *ēptte*.

sē tedēemē, and children, words of constant recurrence.

sē ey ē. This was at first translated *whoever* (Appendix p. 482), by deriving the meaning from the context of several inscriptions in which it occurs; but we now find it rendered *καὶ αὐ τῆς*, and in the bilingual inscription at Antiphellus *εἰ δὲ τῆς*, which must be taken as the meaning; and although in no instance is it divided by stops, we must consider it as three words. It must be observed, that the stops : which separate the words in the Lycian inscriptions are not placed between words in very close relationship to each other; thus the conjunctions are seldom separated by the stops from the following word, and frequently not from the preceding one. This practice will be referred to again. Of the three words here found together, two had been already recognised : *sē* is the conjunction *and*; *ē* had been shown to be a pronoun (p. 472), and must now be rendered *anyone*; and the remaining conjunction *ey* may be compared to the Greek *εἰ*, *if*. We thus find the exact translation to be, *and if anyone*.

We ought to find in the next word the translation of *ἀδικησῶν*, but there is ground for suspicion that we have more than one word in the Lycian, and there seems to be at least one letter wanting at the end of the line. We do not find the same combination of letters in any other inscription, and in the Antiphellus inscription, which contains the words *εἰ δὲ τῆς ἀδικησῶν*, the corresponding Lycian words are *sē ey ē teēde*. We have here *teē* preceding *itatu*; but if we take *teē* for the verb *violate*, we have no employment for the preceding words. We must therefore leave this in doubt.

itatu ēwēūe answers to the *το μνημα τουτο* of the Greek; *itatu* has lost its last letter in the crack across the stone. It occurs in the first line of the inscription with the same meaning, *tomb*: *ēwēūe* is the preposition *this*; it is related to the demonstratives *ēwūinū*, *ēwēeya*, *ēwēūū*, &c.

In the rest of the inscription we can trace no connection between the Greek and the Lycian. In place of the curses denounced in the Greek against the violator of the tomb, the Lycian threatens him with a fine; and owing to an unfortunate gap in the third line, we cannot complete the words.

The next two words must be left untranslated at present: *alada-ūade*, or as it occurs elsewhere *adadaūale*, the author had translated *let him pay a fine*; and every inscription in which it occurs justifies this meaning, as it is always followed by *ada* and a numeral; *ada* is without doubt *a coin* or *sum of money*; we have no clue to the value of the final numeral.

No. 3. *Bilingual Inscription at Antiphellus.*

The present inscription was published by Professor Grotefend in the paper already mentioned (*Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. iv.). From his translation of it, the author is obliged to dissent in several important particulars. The professor's copy was received from M. Raoul Rochette, and had passed through several hands before reaching him, and we need not therefore be surprised that slight errors should have crept into it on the way. It is inter-

esting to have a fresh copy to compare with it, and the author has also had the opportunity of comparing a copy which M. Raoul Rochette obligingly sent to Mr. Fellows.

The two copies agree in the main points, and only differ in a few letters; both agree in the great inequality in length of the different lines, the first line of the Lycian having twenty-six letters in the last copy and the last line forty letters. There is good reason to believe that the first lines are incomplete, and perhaps that the others are also; but as there is a great difference in the length of the two Greek lines, it is not easy to say how much is wanting.

Professor Grotefend has not perceived that the inscription is imperfect, and has endeavoured to fit the Lycian and Greek words together in a very unsatisfactory manner, having altered the alphabet to find the name *Iktasla* in the first word of the second line of the Lycian, which is in reality the name of Iktasla's father. The attention of Mr. Fellows has been called to this inscription, and he may possibly succeed in discovering the remainder; in the meantime we must make the best we can of it in its present state.

The Greek runs thus:—

Ἰκτασλα Ἀντιφελλιτῆς τοῦτ(ο) το μνημα ηργασετο αὐτῷ τε καὶ γυναικὶ καὶ τέκνοις : εἰαν δὲ τις ἀδικήσῃ ἢ ἀγοράσῃ το μνημα ἡλῆτω αὐτὸν ἐπιτν. Ψ.

The only words open to doubt are the last three, which the professor explains as *ἡλῆτε αὐτὸν ἐπιτ(ιμιο)ν* +, which is not confirmed by our fresh copy; yet the meaning he has thus given to the sentence is in every probability correct, *that whoever violates or sells the tomb is to be fined*.

The Lycian, taken line by line, is as follows:—

ēwūinū prinufo mēte prinafatū
 *gtta : ūlaū : tedēeme : ūrppe lade : ēūwe
 sē tedēmē : ēūweyē : sē ey ē teēde : tekē : mūtū :
 mēnē wastto : ūne : wlaūe ēweyēue sē eēdfefēū itēze.

In every other Lycian funereal inscription we find the name of the owner of the tomb; and as it occurs in the Greek translation, it is extremely improbable that it should be omitted in this single instance. We may conclude therefore that it is lost at the end of the first line, and we have room in the same line for the equivalent of *Ἀντιφελλιτῆς*. This word could hardly be expected in its Greek form, but in the older name of *Habessus*, given by Stephanus Byzantinus. In the first word of the second line, Professor Grotefend finds, following his copy, *Uttāilāi*, giving a different value to all the vowels. He considers the words *Uttaila's son* to be the paraphrase of the *Iktasla* of the Greek, and regards the names *Uttaila* and *Iktasla* as identical, the father and son having the same name. In the present copy there are three variations in this word: 1st, there is an imperfect letter at the beginning, which is also clearly given in M. Raoul Rochette's copy, so that we may consider that it certainly exists in the original; 2ndly, the second letter is *g* instead of *u*;

3rdly, there are stops in the middle of the word. If these stops are correct, we have a name which, after taking off the genitive termination, will be reduced to three letters, which is highly improbable, as the great length of the proper names is quite a marked feature of the language. It is much more probable that the stops indicate the place of a letter which has been defaced by time, and that the word had originally ten letters. If we follow Professor Grotefend's conjecture, that the father and son had both the same name, we may fill up the blank at the beginning of the word by *i*, and that in the middle by *s*, and omitting the genitive ending, we shall thus obtain *Igttasūla* for the name, which is sufficiently near to the Greek form. There is however no reason for forcing the two names together, as it is very unusual on these tombs to find the father and son with the same name.

There is no such blank in the next part of the sentence as to make it indispensable that we should add anything at the end of the second line, the words *ūrppe lade ēūwe sē tedēmē*, for his wife and children, making a complete sense; but the shortness of this line makes it probable that something is wanting there also, and we accordingly find that *εαυτω* has no representative in the Lycian part of the inscription. By adding at the end of the line the common words *atle ēūwe*, himself, we should fill up the blank space, and bring the Lycian into harmony with the Greek. Professor Grotefend avoids this difficulty by regarding *ūrppe* as the pronoun *himself*, in which the author cannot agree. The professor's translation of the common phrase *ūrppe atle ēūwe* by *sibi personæ suæ*, instead of *pro personâ suâ*, as rendered by the author, appears forced, and is contradicted by the way in which *ūrppe* is used in several inscriptions; while the translation *for* is always consistent with the construction to be expected. Moreover, if this word were a pronoun we should find it declined, which is not the case.

The last sentence presents more difficulties, which are increased by the doubt whether the lines are complete. Judging merely by the length of the third line, we might imagine that it had contained another word, but we have no clue to it.

sē ey ē is here translated *εαν δε τις*, which was analysed under the last inscription. If we adhere as closely as we can to the Greek, which is our safest course, we must connect *teēde* with *αδικηση*; as the latter word occurs in the bilingual inscription at Levis, we look for the same word to answer to it in the Lycian part of that inscription, and there we have *teē* preceding the words *this tomb*. The termination *de* is frequently an enclitic; if we regard it so in this instance, there would remain in both inscriptions *teē* for the verb *violate*, and to this we have an analogy in the Greek verb *δαιω*; but then there is no word of a similar form to answer to *αγοραση*. If we drop that verb for the present, we can have no difficulty in translating *tekē mūtū* by *this tomb*: the first of the two words is analogous to *θηκη* and the Latin *theca*; the second is very close to *mūte*, which we find frequently in the Lycian inscriptions as a demonstrative pronoun.

It is difficult to make anything of the last line, which appears to contain a great deal more than the Greek counterpart. It is to be hoped that we may obtain another copy of the inscription, for neither of those yet received is entirely to be relied on, as in the latter part of this line we have combinations of letters which are very unusual.

No. 4. *Fragment of Bilingual Inscription at Tlos.*

The copy of this inscription is too imperfect to have any value; the middle part is entirely lost, and we have only the commencement of the Lycian and the end of the Greek portion, so that we have nothing common to the two. The Lycian must be read *ēwūinū itatū mūte prinafatū*, *this tomb which made*; the name cannot be made out. The Greek probably ends with *εαυτῷ καὶ τῇ γυναικὶ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτοῦ*. We may hope that some future traveller will make a more perfect copy, as every scrap of the language which is accompanied by a literal translation is of value.

These four are the only true bilingual inscriptions yet brought from Lycia; there are among the other inscriptions several in which either Greek or Latin is found on the same tomb with Lycian, but the two portions have no reference to one another. The Greek or Roman inhabitants appear to have made use of the ancient tombs, without defacing the original inscriptions. These will be pointed out as they occur.

In endeavouring to elucidate some of the remaining inscriptions, the author proposes to take them in the order in which they may be most readily studied, beginning with the simplest, and placing those together which have most resemblance in the words or construction; so that the simple phrases may lead us on to those which are more difficult to be understood.

No. 5. *At Koorostan, the ancient Cyane.*

ēwūinū : prinafu : mūnē : prinafatū : godrēūela : ūrppe lade : ēūwe
This tomb which made Godrewela for wife his

Below this is a Greek inscription in three lines, relating to the tomb of Jason and Seras, which has no connection with the above. Mr. Daniell adds, "over the Greek is another Greek inscription, scarcely a word of which is traceable;" and a slight sketch shows the position of the inscriptions on the tomb.

No. 6. *Under the Acropolis of Gandyva.*

The inscription is imperfect, but can easily be restored, with the exception of one letter in the name.

*ēwūinū gopu mēnē prinafatū : gorey*una ūrppe lade ēūwe sē*
This tomb which made Goreyuna for wife his and
tedēemē
children

No. 7.

poreüemētete : prinafatē : ma₊asaū : tedēeme gopu : ēwūinū ūrppe :
Poreuemetete made Ma₊asa's son tomb this for
 atle : ēūwe : sē tedēmē : ēūweyē
self his and children his

This sentence is differently constructed from the others; to render it intelligible in English, it must be translated *Poreuemetete, the son of Ma₊asa, had this tomb made for himself and his children.*

No. 8. *At Limyra.*

ēwūinū gopo mūte prinafatū
 ēsētē opēsēu atle ēūwe sē lade sē tedēmē

The names cannot be fully made out, and have this peculiarity, that the father's name in the genitive is not followed by the word *son*; *gopo*, a *tomb*, has a different termination from its usual form *gopu*; in a few instances we find it written *gopa*.

No. 9. *At Limyra.*

oprēuela : keroū : tedēeme : ūnū pēreklēūē

We find nearly the same name in an inscription copied at Pinara by Mr. Fellows ('Lycia,' Plate 30, No. 11), *Orēwella* forming *Orē-wellaūa* in the dative.

A letter has been altered in the last word to bring it to *Pēreklēūē*, which seems to be the gentile name of *Pēreclē*, a town of which we have several coins. The first found had lost the first letter, and reading the name as *Ereclē*, the author proposed to refer them to *Heraclea*; but several perfect coins have been since found, which leave no doubt that the name is really *Pēreclē*; one of them is figured in the Appendix to Mr. Fellows's 'Lycia,' p. 465, No. 31. Mr. Birch has conjectured that the legend on these coins is the name of Pericles, a king of Lycia mentioned by Theopompus (lib. 12 in Photii Biblioth. cod. 176). But this opinion can hardly be maintained, as all the Lycian coins appear struck in the names of the towns. We shall meet with other names ending in *ūe* or *ūē*, which are probably also gentile forms. The derivatives of *Pēreclē* occur in several inscriptions found at or near Limyra, and (as we learn from Mr. Forbes) Mr. Daniell concluded in consequence that it was the original Lycian name of Limyra, a conjecture which appears to be in the highest degree probable.

ūnū is found in a similar phrase in several inscriptions, and although its meaning cannot be fixed with certainty, we cannot be far wrong if we render the last two words *native of Pēreclē*, *citizen of Pēreclē*, *by birth a Pereclean*, or some such expression.

One of the inscriptions, copied by Mr. Cockerell at Kakava near Limyra, and published (No. 3) in Walpole's Travels, has an analogous phrase. It is nearly perfect, and may be restored thus:—

ēwūinū prinafu mūte prinafatū gaofuneme ūrppe lade ēūwe sē tedēemē
ēūweyē ūnū pēreklēū gitafata

The first part is perfectly intelligible, but the last three words furnish considerable trouble, and the last word, *gitafata*, is quite unknown. There are a number of forms resembling this in other inscriptions, *gitafasa*, *gitafataūe*, *gitafatēūe*, *gitawo*, *gitawato*, *gitafatutofe*, &c., from which we may conclude that it belongs to a verb. In the meantime we can only translate the inscription conjecturally by "Gaofuneme, a citizen of Pēreclē, made this tomb for his wife and his children."

No. 10. *On a Sarcophagus-Tomb at Xanthus.*

ēwūinū : prinafu : mūte prinafatū : mērēūe :
kodalaū : gitlaū : tedēeme treya trōaūe : pinataūe :
oūaūe : ūrppe : prinēze : ūnū : gitafata : gērīgēūe

This was copied by Mr. Fellows. In the above version we have placed the stops after *ūrppe*, in place of the upright stroke in the original. It presents so many points of difference from the usual phraseology of the short inscriptions, that the following remarks are offered with great diffidence.

The name of the owner appears to be *Mērēūe*. Between this and the word *tedēeme* we have two genitives without any conjunction between them. Of this no other instance has been observed. The most probable explanation is, that the first is the name of the father, the second of the grandfather, and that we must translate it, *Mērēūe the son of Kodala the son of Gitla*.

In the second line we seem to have after the word *treya* three gentile names, at least we have three words with the same termination; of which the first, *trōaūe*, may fairly be taken for the adjective of *Trōas*, the Lycian name of Tlos. It seems probable that in *treya* we have a derivative from the numeral *three*, and that *Mērēūe* describes himself as a citizen of the three towns of Tlos, Pinota and Oua; but we do not find any names in the geographers answering to the last two.

The tomb is made *ūrppe prinēze*, for his servant; but instead of the servant's name we have a description that he is a native or citizen of *Gērīgē*. This last name is so near the town alluded to at p. 195 as *Gēreja*, that we may perhaps doubt the accuracy of Mr. Fellows's copy of the last word of the inscription.

No. 11. *Near Armostel (near Limyra).*

gitlapunē : prinafatē : pēreklēū : maūenaza : ēpitewazaū tedēeme

The word *maūenaza* does not occur again, but as it follows the genitive *Pēreklēū*, we may conjecture that it is the title of an office in the town of Perecle filled by the party named. The inscription will then be, "Gitlapune, a magistrate of Perekle, son of Epitewaza, made this."

No. 12. *At Gandyva, the ancient Karduba.*

oūowē : krōēūawodaū tedēeme rērtēna touēs

In several of the Greek inscriptions from Lycia published by Mr. Fellows, the numerals δς or B are used either for *grandson*, or to mark a second name. [The references to the inscriptions in which it is so used will be found in his Index of Greek Words under δς.]

In this inscription *touēs* has apparently the same meaning of *twice*, the inscription being either *Ouowē the son of Kroēūawoda the grandson of Rērtēna*; or *Ouowē the son of Kroēūawoda, also called Rērtēna*. The absence of the genitive to *Rērtēna* makes the latter the more probable translation. We find *touēs* used as grandson elsewhere. The lower inscription at p. 225 of the 'Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor' has been corrected by Mr. Fellows to *Aūōade Pezewedēū tedēeme sē Uapdumēū touēs*; that is, "Aūōade, Pezewedē's son and Uapdumē's grandson;" and in the twenty-sixth line of the south-west side of the obelisk at Xanthus we have *touēs* after a genitive name, in the part of the inscription which appears to give the genealogy of the son of Harpagus. In a very early stage of these inquiries, Mr. Fox Talbot suggested to Mr. Fellows that *touēs* meant grandson.

We now come to several inscriptions of greater length and with a more complicated construction. The difficulty of understanding them increases nearly in a geometrical ratio. Some phrases here and there are selected for elucidation, without attempting to translate whole inscriptions; and the reader will excuse greater liberties of conjecture than have hitherto been taken; but the degree of evidence which there is for each conjecture shall be pointed out scrupulously.

No. 13. *Near Limyra.*

ēwūinū : gopu : mēte : prinafatū : zaūama : ddafupartaū
This tomb which made Zaūama Ddafuparta's
 tedēeme : mē itēpetute : zaūunu : sē ladu : sē : tedēemeu : ēūwe
son, which he inscribed to Zaūuna and wife and son his
 kwe : tekē : te itēpetade : atlaūe : tewē kweyēue : tewētē :
which tomb also he inscribed for himself
 alaūadete : mēnē : muūue : towēete, &c.

There are two copies of this inscription taken by Mr. Daniell and Mr. Forbes, only differing slightly. Both have been made use of in the above version, only altering *tedēemeg* in the second line into *tedēemeu*, to preserve uniformity in the declensions and avoid a termination in *g*, of which there is no other instance.

The first line is in the usual phraseology; but in the second line, instead of the formula previously met with, stating for whom the tomb is intended, we have another expression, *mē itēpetute*, &c., clearly answering a similar purpose. In many Greek inscriptions from Lycia we find *τοῦτο το μνημα επιγραψε εαυτω και*, &c., or some

similar expression, and these suggest the translation of the word before us to be *inscribed to* or *registered for*. The whole form of these inscriptions shows them to be title-deeds of the tombs, and it is reasonable to expect in them the use of the same formal expressions which we find in the Greek inscriptions at a later period in the same localities.

Mēitēpetute and *teitēpetade* are each written as one word; but it has been already remarked, that many of the smaller words are not separated by stops. Of the verb to which *itēpetade* belongs, we find many forms in different inscriptions; and in No. 16, which has a phraseology very similar to this, we have *mūnē itēpetūte* used in the same manner, so that there can be no doubt that we must consider *mē* and *te* as separate words. *Mē* is related to *mēnē*, *mūnē*, *mēte* and *mūte*, all of which are used as pronouns. The meaning required here is *which*. *Te* is often used as an enclitic conjunction, exactly answering to the Greek *τε*; but here it is joined to the following instead of the preceding word.

The terminations of the next three nouns in *u* after the verb *itēpetute* establish another case in the declension of the nouns. We have in No. 5 (Fellows, pl. 36.) *lada* as the nominative; the common phrase, *ūrpe lade sē tedēeme*, and this form *ladu*, supply either the ablative and dative, or the instrumental and dative if we adopt the oriental cases. In No. 25 we have *ladū* as a plural after *ūrpe*, and in No. 18 (which is very imperfect and doubtful) *ladue* seems to be used as the dative plural.

The word *kwe* at the beginning of the third line reminds us strongly of the relative pronouns in other Indo-European languages; *tekē* has already been translated *tomb* at p. 202, and *atlaūe* is a case of *atle*, *self*; these give a reasonable meaning to this short phrase. The rest is still unknown. The word *kweyēūe* is perhaps the dative plural of the relative *kwe*, and suggests the probability of our finding here some such expression as, *and to whom he may give permission*, which is common in the Greek inscriptions.

No. 14. *At Myra.* No. 18, Plate 36, of Mr. Fellows.

ēwūinū prinafū mēnē prinafatū ddawasa sitopēū tedēeme ūrpe lade
This tomb which made Ddawasa Sitope's son for wife

ēūwe sē tedēmē sē ūkē late ddawasa. mēnē itēpetute itepatēze
his and children and Ddawasa, which he inscribed to Itepatēze

sē ladu ēūwe kwe tekē mē enepē itēpetuto
and wife his, which tomb inscribed

tewē enepē ūlāme tofēto ūlāme mē etofēte tekē tewēe
tomb

itēpetade tekē mēnē etlēūe towēete trāmele ūofēdre
he inscribed tomb this for himself Tramele

sē trōas sē muūuē ūofēdre
and Tlos and

This inscription was published by Mr. Fellows, but the present version is so much better that it is again published; the cause of the discrepancies is explained by a note in Mr. Daniell's pocket-book:—"It is so high, that one wrote while another dictated the letters." The new copy has been followed in all but the name *Ddawasa*; the repetition of the syllable *wa* is not in the former copy nor in the next line, where the name occurs again, and is evidently an error.

The expressions of this inscription resemble those of the preceding, No. 13. Some words have been translated, but the rest must be left in doubt. The two names, *Trāmele* and *Trōas*, in the latter part, deserve attention. The first is the ancient name of the Lycian people, given by the Greeks as *Tremilæ* or *Termilæ*; the other is the town of *Tlos*. [See Appendix to Fellows's 'Lycia,' p. 465.]

No. 15. *At Antiphellus.*

This agrees very closely with No. 13, but is so imperfect that little is to be learnt from it, as without a better copy we can hardly rely upon its accuracy, for which reason it is passed over. It is the tomb of *Edamagzza the son of Oūereyē*, and the Lycian has no connection whatever with the Latin epitaph above it, placed by *Claudia Regeria Herminia* to the memory of her sister.

No. 16.

There are so many words in this inscription which appear to require correction, and so little that is yet understood, that no transcript of it has been given.

The first short line seems to have been abandoned by the sculptor on account of its incorrectness, and he has begun again in the next line. The same has happened with the inscription No. 14 of Mr. Fellows's Plate 36.

The beginning of the inscription is clear enough:—

ēwūenū : gopū mūte prinafatū : sggotraze mūnē itepetūte :
This tomb which made Sggotraze which he inscribed to

sggotraze : sē ladu : ēūwe sē tedēemes ēūwes
Sggotraze and wife his and children his

We have here a termination in *s* to the dative plural, instead of the lengthening of the last vowel, *tedēemes ēūwes* being used instead of the usual form *tēdēmē ēūweyē*. There is only one other inscription, No. 17, which has a similar form. So great a change in the declension of the language makes it probable that these two inscriptions are of a different date from the others; and as the change is an approach to the Greek form of the dative plural, these two may perhaps be looked upon as the most modern specimens which we have of the language.

The Greek inscription has no reference whatever to the Lycian below it.

No. 17. *Near Armostel.*

The orthography of this inscription is so peculiar, that it might be as well to see another copy before we meddle with the greater part of it; but the conclusion must not be altogether passed over, as it adds an important word to our stock.

ēpi tē : ladu : ūme : sē tedēemes : ūmes sē mēlēwe sē tedēeme

In several inscriptions *ēpi* appears to be used as the preposition *for* in the place of *ūrppe*. If that is its meaning in the present instance, the next word *tē* must be an article, the two answering to the Greek *ἐπὶ τῇ*. This can only be admitted on the supposition that the language of this inscription is altogether corrupted by intercourse with the Greeks; and this is perhaps too great a change to rest upon such slight evidence. The words *ūme* and *ūmes*, found in the connection in which they stand, are without doubt the singular and plural of the pronoun *your*. They occur nowhere else, as all the other inscriptions appear to run in the third person. We have here again the plural ending in *s*, as in the last inscription, which marks a great approach to the Greek form. The last sentence is therefore, *for your wife and your children, and Mēlēwe and son.*

No. 18. *Near Armostel.*

This has a good deal of resemblance to the last inscription, but is too imperfect to be of much value in its present state.

No. 19. *At Xanthus, copied by Mr. Fellows.*

ēwūinē prinafo mēnē prinafatū eyētroülē : ūorttofētēū : fasaza :
This tomb which made Eyetroule Uorttofete's relation?

ūrppe lade sē tedēmē sē ey ē itatētu tēse mite ada :
for wife and children and if anyone buries herein, &c.

The above is similar to the inscriptions explained in the Appendix to Mr. Fellows's 'Lycia,' pp. 482 and 483. One line is lost at the end, in which a fine is imposed on the transgressor. The only unknown word is *fasaza*, which does not occur elsewhere, and is apparently a term of relationship.

No. 20. *On the ascent to Cadyanda from Ozunlee.*

opazeyūnē : prinafatē ūrppe : prinēze : ēūwe sē ey ē : itatutū
Opazeyune made for servant his and if anyone buries

tasa : meita : mēlēemē sē : adadaūale ada |||
herein and let him pay a fine adas 3

According to Mr. Forbes, this inscription was copied under some difficulties, and it contains several errors, but none of importance. Its import resembles the last. We find here a new word, *mēlēemē*, which does not occur again, and remains unknown.

No. 21. *At Limyra.*

ēwūinŭ : gopu mēnē : prinafatŭ : tēworssēle *ezasa*aū : ddēdelosu :
This tomb which made Teworssele

ita : aūizēte . . . ēre sē gitawora ūnŭ : pērekleūē : gitafata
Pereklean

One letter is wanting at the beginning of each line, which is easily restored in the first and third lines. The second line cannot be much relied on.

The name of *Teworssele* occurs in the inscriptions below the battle-scene published by Mr. Fellows, p. 207; and as the tomb with this inscription is immediately below that piece of sculpture, we may conclude that they were erected by the same individual. The first line is in the usual style; the first word of the second line is probably the name of *Teworssele's* father in the genitive case; the rest of that line is unintelligible. The third line consists of the phrase which is supposed to designate either a *native* or a *citizen of Perekle*.

No. 22. *At Limyra, under the Battle-scene.*

In the copy published by Mr. Fellows, it was not clear whether this was all to be read together or not; it is evident from the present version that it is to be read in three separate parts; but this assistance is not enough, and the greater part of these short inscriptions is still obscure.

The first phrase is as follows:—

Tēworssēle : prinafatē : losi ppē : ūte : fazeuē :

The first two words are *Teworssele made*; the last word, *fazeuē*, is probably from *faze*, which we find in the compound *ērafazeya*, a *tomb* or *monument*, and which may have the same meaning in this sentence. *Teworssele* was the name of the owner of the last tomb, No. 21.

The second sentence runs thus:—

Tēworasēle : prinafatē gasawala : ūkē : ēsē : pereklē : tēwētē : artto
 āparu : sē āparūē : tēluze

Excepting the first two words, which are the same as in the first sentence, and the name of the town *Perekle*, the whole has still to be made out.

The third sentence is very imperfectly preserved, and is quite obscure.

No. 23. *At Armostel, near Limyra.*

ēsēdēplūmēyē : mēyadŭ : tēse : meite : afaūae : gopa ēūwe
Esedeplume's family? herein may bury in tomb his

sē enē : ēpi : poitŭ mēe : afaūe : tēse : adadaūale
for who buries here let him pay a fine

No. 24. *Near Armostel.*

ēsēdēplūmēyē : mēyadū : tēse : meite afaūae : gopa ēwēūe : mēe :
Esedeplume's family? herein may bury in tomb of them, who

afaūae tēse : adadaūale :
buries here let him pay a fine

The close resemblance of these two inscriptions is very remarkable. Of the latter there are two copies, taken by Mr. Daniell and Mr. Forbes; from the comparison of these with one another and with the other inscription, the version given above is made up.

The first word in each, *Esēdēplūmēyē*, appears to be a possessive adjective formed from *Esēdēplūme*, which we find in the inscription of Plate 36 of Mr. Fellows's 'Lycia' as the name of the owner of a tomb at Limyra. So in Nos. 27 and 28, from the name *Eyamara* we have the adjective *Eyamarayē* as a possessive.

mēyadu does not occur again. We get an approach to the meaning of the sentence if we suppose it to mean *family*.

tēse meite and *tēse* have been already translated *herein*, which may do in these sentences, although it does not give us a very neat translation. Professor Grotfend gives another meaning to these words in the memoir already quoted, p. 297. He translates the common phrase,

sē eyē itadu tēse meite,
welcher Frēvel übet hiergegen.

This translation has been overturned by our finding *itatū* rendered in Greek by *μνημα*, p. 197; and the inscriptions now under consideration would not bear the meaning which he gives to *tēse meite*.

afaūe is evidently the verb. It is applied both to the owner of the tomb and to the transgressor; its meaning must therefore be *to bury*, *to use*, or some word which may be substituted for them.

gopa ēūwe or *gopa ēwēūe* are *his tomb* and *their tomb*; *gopa* occurs frequently as a *tomb*; *ēūwe* is *his* or *their*; *ēwēūe*, the genitive plural of *them*.

sēene ēpi poitū must be left as unknown. It is evidently a complete phrase, as No. 24 is perfect without it. In some other inscriptions we have the same phrase, or one which nearly resembles this. In the fourth line of No. 26 it is proposed to restore the same words, and the broken portion of the third line of the bilingual inscription at Levis, No. 2, might be filled up *mē eyē ēpi poiēte*. In the lower inscription of p. 225 of Mr. Fellows we have *peyētūū*, and below *peytū*, which has since been corrected by Mr. Fellows to *peyētū*. It is probable that the word should be *poiētū* in the present instance.

adadaūale has been frequently met with as *let him pay a fine*, and it is always followed by numerals; these are here indicated by a contraction.

mēe may be taken for *who*, being probably related to *mē*, *mēnē*, &c., *which*.

In this manner we obtain a conjectural translation of the inscriptions, which must be received for the present with great doubts.

The two Greek words Φοινικος Τυριφ, which occur below the inscription No. 24, appear to have no connection with it.

No. 25. *On a Rock-Tomb at Sura.*

ēwūinū : prinafu : mēte : prinafatā : mezpēteyē : moruzaū : touēs :
This tomb which made Mezpēteyē Moruza's grandson?

mloūedaza : sorēze . . .
Mlouedaza Sura

ūrppe atle : ēuwe : sē lade : sē tedēemē : ēūweyē : sē ladū : atle :
for himself and wife and children his and wives self
 ūrzze . . s . zeyū : mētē : itatute
tomb

ēwūinū : ūutu : sē ladu : ūrppe sē mēe : tade tekē : tekē : mēnē :
this and wives for and who tomb tomb which
 wlaūe : sttēwe : sorēze : sē dawu
Sura

ūrāmu : eyasē : atlaūe mē pūte ūuguate : mloūedaza : ddēepnē
themselves Mlouedaza

. o . . gezūne tērē : mloūedazue
to Mlouedaza

mēde : itēgoptte : ūrāmu : pitwaūe . : itēnū grofe : mēdē tēfo ☉
 komēzēete : oūazata : tofēre sē

mezrateyēūē komēūe : adaeyu : ||— orazeyun : gade : ū : sē : ēpi
to Mezrateye

a ē ez i ē f p w s ☉ enē : komazate

mēnē : pddū : wla : sāmte ēwe : sorēze

The preceding inscription is far from being correct throughout: some of the obvious errors are set right, but there are others which can only be mended by another copy; the latter half of the sixth line especially wants revising. There is very little of the inscription yet understood, but there are some points of interest in it which are worth pointing out, of which the principal is connected with the name of the town. It is found at Sura, and the name *Sorēze* occurs three times, at the end of the first and last lines and in the third line. This is probably an inflection of *Sorēzu*, the termination in *ēzu* being the Lycian equivalent of *ησος*, which with *ασος* and *εσος* is so common in the Greek names of the towns of Asia Minor. Of this another instance was pointed out (Appendix, p. 461) in the legend *Pttarazu* of a coin referred to Patara. The first line is marked as incomplete; the word was probably *Sorēzeūe*, a native of Sura.

The owner of the tomb is described as *Mezpēteyē : Moruzaū : touēs :*

Mlouedaza. In the sixth line the name is written *Mezrateyē*, one or the other spelling being incorrect, and *Mlouedaza* occurs again below. Taking *touēs* as the equivalent of the Greek *δῆς*, we have the same doubt already pointed out at p. 206, whether to translate the phrase *Mezpēteyē the son of Moruza, also called Mlouedaza*, or *Mezpeteye the grandson of Moruza*, in which latter case *Mlouedaza* may be the name of an office in the town of Sura, as has already been conjectured of a word much resembling it in No. 11, *Maūenaza*; in fact the two words are so close, that we may suspect an error in the spelling of the latter. The former is confirmed by its recurrence.

The word *adaeyū* in the sixth line, followed by a numeral, must be connected with the payment of a fine.

The rest of this long inscription must be left in obscurity for the present.

No. 26. *On a Sarcophagus-Tomb at Cyane.*

ēwūinū : *faze* : mēnē prinafatū : g

This tomb which made G

sē enē ēpi poyētū ēsēdē inēfē :

sē etesesēne : poreūemētewa : ofatesēū :
for Poreuemetē Ofatese's

nūne : sē enē ēpi poyētū : ēsēdē inēfē : magaū

sē epipodū : edugrē : magaū : gaūwogepe

Owing to the extremely imperfect state of the copy of this inscription, greater liberties have been taken than usual with the version given above. It appears from a memorandum of Mr. Daniell's, that the inscription is complete at the end, and that the breaks in the second and fifth lines are caused by flaws in the stone, in which no letters are lost.

The forms of several of the letters are unusual, and there are also peculiarities in the orthography, the letter **⌘** being used in the first word instead of **W**, of which we have another instance in No. 31; and the same letter being employed in the dative, *Poreūemētewa*, is also peculiar. We might attach more importance to these variations if the copy of the inscription were more perfect.

The second word had, if we may trust the copy, four letters, and ended in *ze*; its meaning is obviously *tomb* or *monument*. There is no word in any other inscription which exactly fulfils these conditions; but below the battle-scene, No. 22, we probably have *fazeuē*, which may be an oblique case of *faze*, and in *ērafazeya*, a *monument* or *tomb*, we have a compound word containing the same root.

Nune must be some term of relationship; it is used in a similar manner in other inscriptions.

Nos. 27 and 28. *On the two Sides of the Door of a Tomb at Rhodiopolis.*

These inscriptions relate to the same tomb, but do not appear to be in continuation of one another. The phraseology of both is dif-

ferent from those already examined, and the second contains very few words which have been yet made out.

The tomb is stated in the first inscription to be made by *Eyamara* the son of *Tersseglē*, and the words *tekē eyamarayē* at the beginning of the second inscription mean *Tomb of Eyamara*, the second word being the possessive adjective derived from the name *Eyamara*.

No. 29. *At Antiphellus.*

The tomb on which this inscription occurs is figured by Mr. Fellows, p. 219 of 'Journal in Asia Minor,' and the beginning of the inscription was given by him as No. 23, Plate 36. The whole inscription has since been published by M. Tessier. On comparing the present copy with that given by the latter gentleman, the differences between them prove so great as to discourage the author from any attempt to restore the text. The little which was copied by Mr. Fellows corresponds much more nearly with the present copy than with M. Tessier's, and consequently confirms in part the accuracy of our new version.

The inscription is very different from all those which we have yet considered; it has none of the ordinary phrases of the monumental inscriptions, nor do we find anything which proves that it is, strictly speaking, funereal. Many of the words and expressions correspond with those on the obelisk at Xanthus, and it may possibly prove to be a decree or public document.

The remaining inscriptions are so imperfect that it is useless to attempt to translate them. In some instances portions might easily be restored by comparing them with the more perfect specimens; but this would only lengthen the present paper without adding to our stock of knowledge. The following short notice of them may suffice:—

No. 30. *At Limyra.*

The tomb of *Mūnouē* the son of *Tālēmē*.

No. 31. *At Limyra.*

Only the beginnings of each line remain, and these are very imperfect. The names are all lost.

No. 32. *At Limyra.*

The latter half of each line is lost.

No. 33. *At Limyra.*

Full of blanks and unintelligible.

No. 34. *At Limyra.*

Over the door of a rock-tomb are two words in Greek characters, ΜΑΣΑ ΚΟΑΤΑ. On the lintel is a Lycian inscription in four lines, of which only the last few words of the last line could be copied, the rest being very imperfect.

ΜΟΛΛΕΤΑΙ ΤΑΙΣ ΔΑΡΑΡΑΡΑΝΟ
ΤΑΙΣ ΤΕΔΑΕΜΑΙΣ ΕΙΣ
ΝΑΜΑΧΧΕ: ΡΑΔΑΡΑΔΙ
ΕΜΟΛΛΙΣΙΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΓΑΡΑΜΙΕ
ΥΝΑΙΞΙΝΤΑΙ ΣΕΑΟΤΩΝ
ΗΜΑΤΟΥ ΤΟ
ΑΝΤΩΝ

ΙΤΟΜΝΗΜΑΝΗΤΩΑΥΤΟΝΕΠΙΤΛΥ

+ΡΓΓΕΛΑΔΕ: ↑+ΒΕ:

↑: ΓΡΕΝΑΦΑΤ↑: Γ↑ΡΕΚΛ↑
↑ΙΑ: ↑ΛΞΕΤΕΒΑΙΑ↑
ΜΕ

ΛΣΟΜΕΝΣΥΝΧΩΡΗΣΑΙΝ
ΗΜΩΣΦΕΞΟΥΣΙΑΝΕΧΟΝ
ΛΑΗΝΩΦΗΜΙΣ ΕΙ

↑ΔΑ+ΤΕ↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑ΒΥΞΕΝΥ: ΓΡΕΝΑΦ
ΤΡΕΙΑΤΡΒΒΑ+Ε: ΓΞΙ

↑ΒΥΙΝ↑ΑΡΞΑΡΦΟ
Μ↑Ν↑ΓΡΕΝΑΦΑΤΥ
ΕΙ↑ΤΡΟΥΛ↑: +ΟΡΤΤΟ
↑↑↑↑↑: ΦΑΡΙΑ:
+ΡΓΓΕΛΑΔΕ:

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑
↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑↑

↑ΒΥΞΕΝΨ: ΓΡΕΝΑΡΨ: ΜΑΤΕ: ΓΡΕΝΑΡΨ: ΤΟΤΝ/ΜΛΟΤΕΔΑΙΑ: ΣΟΡΑΙΕ"
+ΡΓΓΕΑΤΛΕ: Α+ΒΕ: ΣΑΛΑΔΕ: ΣΑΤΕΔΑΕΜΑ: Α+ΡΕΙ: ΣΑΔΑΔΨ: ΑΤΑΡ: +ΡΙΙΙ: ΙΕΙΨ: ΜΑΤΑ: ΞΤΑ+ΥΤΕ
↑ΒΞΕΝΨ: +ΥΤΨ: ΣΑΛΑΔΨ: +ΡΓΓΕΣΑΜΑΕ: ΤΑΔΕ: ΤΕΚΑ: ΤΕΚΑ: ΜΑΝΑ: ΚΑΛΑ: ΡΕ ΣΤΤΑΒΕ: ΣΟΡΑΙΕ: ΣΑΔΑΒΨ
+Ρ+ΜΨ: ΕΙΑΣΑ: Α: ΤΑ+ΕΜΑΓΨΤΕ+ΨΥΑΤΕ: ΜΛΟΤΕΔΑΙΑ: ΔΔΑΕΓΝΑΟΨΕΙΨΝΕΤΑΡΑ: ΜΛΟΤΕΔΑΙΒΕ
ΜΑΑΕ: ΞΤΑΨΟΛΤΤΕ: +ΡΧΜΨ: ΠΞΤΒΑ+Ε: ΞΤΑΝΨΨΡΟΦΕ: ΜΑΔΑΤΑΤΑ: ΤΟΦΑΡΕΣΑ: ΤΟΦΑΡΕΣΑ:
ΜΕΙΡΑΤΕΙΑ+ΑΚΟΜΑ+Ε: ΑΔΑΕΙΨ: ΙΙ-ΟΡΑΙΕΙΨΝ: ΨΑΔΕ: Ψ: ΣΑ: Α+ΕΙΞΑΦΑΚΣ): ΕΝΑ: ΚΟΜΑΙΑΤΕ
ΜΑΝΑ: ΓΔΔΨ: ΚΑΛΑ: ΣΧΜΑΤΕΑΒΕ: ΣΟΡΑΙΕ

ΑΒΝΞΕΝΨ: ΑΡΕΝΑΡΨΜΑΝΑΡΑΡΕΝΑΡΨ
ΕΙΑΡΑΡΑ: ΤΑΡΑΨΕΨΑ+Ψ: ΤΕΔΑΕΜΕΜΑΛΕ
ΙΑ+ΕΦΑΔΡΨΞΕΝΑ+ΕΑΨΥΤΑΤΡΑΝΑΒΕΙΑΤΕ
ΡΞΕΝΑΙΕΣΑΤΤΑΡΕΑΔΑΕΙΨΜΑΝΑΞΕΤΑΡΨΥΤΨ
ΓΕΒΞΙΑΤΕΤΑΡΑ+ΨΜΑΕΙΑΝΑ: +ΡΓΓΕΤΨΥΤΕ

↑ΒΙΝΨΨΟΡΨ: ΜΑΤΕ: ΓΡΕΝΑΡΨ
ΦΥΤΕ: ΝΒΞΑ+ΨΑΤΕΙΑ
ΜΑΤΤΛΑΔΕ: ΚΑΒΕΞΕΤΨΤΑ
ΣΑΤΤΛΑΔΕΙΤΡΙΙΟΒΕ: ΨΧΜΨ
↑ΒΑΕ: Ψ: ΚΑΠΕ: ΞΤΑΓΕΣΕΣΨΝΕ
ΤΕΣΑΤΕΣΑ: ΕΓΓ
ΑΤΕ

↑ΒΥΞΕΝΨ: ΨΟΓΨ: ΜΑΤΕ: ΓΡΕΝΑΡΨ: Μ+ΝΟΤΑ: ΤΧΑΕΜΑ+ΤΕΔΑΕΜΑΕΙΝΤΑΙΕ ΒΥΞΕΝΨΟΓΨΜΑΤΕΡΡΕΝΑ Τ
↑ΑΕ: ΣΑΤΕΔΑΕΜΕ: +ΒΕ: ΑΔΑΡΞΕΝΑΡΑ: ΜΑ: ΞΚΑ: ΑΑΤΑΙ: ΜΞΝΔΥΑΝΑ: ΞΤΑΕΓ ΟΦΨΜΕ ΑΡΑΔΑΝΑ ΣΑ
ΕΝΦΕΞΑΤΑΝΑΝΑ: ΑΑΡ: +ΑΔΕ: ΤΕΚΑ: ΚΒΕ: ΨΚΑΝΕ
ΜΑΣΑ ΚΟΑΤΑ
ΝΕΝΡΑΜΑΡΕ: ΣΑΝΑΡΑΝΞ: ΕΤΑ+Ε: ΚΥΞΕΤΕ: ΤΡΧΜΕΔΕ: +ΕΟΦΑ+ΕΣΑΡΑΔΑΝΑ+ΒΕ ΜΑΤΕΣΑΤΕ: ΓΡΕΝΑΡΨ: ΜΑΤΛΑΔΕΑΛΑΒ: ΠΞΤΡΞΙΝΕΑ

ΑΑ-ΒΑΡΑΙ-ΑΡΕΝΑΡΨ
ΤΑ-ΚΑΒΕ+Α-ΜΨΜΑΤΕΙΑ
ΜΕΞΑ

ΤΕΚΑ: ΕΙΑΡΑΡΑΙΑ: ΤΕΒΑ: ΑΡΑΔΕ: Α+ΒΕ
ΤΡΔΕ ΤΕΚΑ ΚΒΕ: ΤΕΚΑ+ΤΤΒΑΔΕΨΤΕΓ
ΚΒΕΙΑ+Ε: ΤΕΚΑ: ΜΑ+ΤΤΨΜΕ ΨΥΑΒΑ+ΨΑΨ
ΡΑΔΡΨΞΕΝΕ: ΨΧΜΨΜΑΚΧΜΑ: ΞΕΤΑΡΑΦΨ
ΨΑΡΨ: ΣΨΝΑ: ΤΑΨΨΤΦ: ΚΥΞΕΤΕ: ΤΡΧΜΕΛΕΙΨ
ΣΑΕΤΑΑ+Ε: ΑΟΝΑΜΑΔΑΞΕ: ΣΑΚΟΜΑΑΙΑΤΕ
ΣΑΤΑΤΑΡΕ: ΟΤΑΙΑΤΡΑ: ΜΑΛΕ: ΦΑΔΡΑΞΕΝΕ
ΣΑΕΡΑΨ: ΕΙΡΑ: +ΡΧΜΨ: Α+ΒΨ: ΜΑΓΕΙΑΨ
ΜΟΓΧΜΑ: ΜΕΞΕΤΑ: ΜΑΤΕΜΑΡΙΑΤΕ: ΤΑΡΞΑ
ΤΕΚΑ+ΡΓΓΕΤΨΝΑΚΒΕΓΔΑΨΤΑ+ΒΑ
(+ΑΙΑΤΑΤΑΡΑ: ΑΒΑ+Ε: ΚΟΜΑΨΕ: +ΡΓΡΑ
ΣΑΓΕΙΑΨΑΛΕΓΨΜΑΚΟΜΑΑΙΑΤΕΞΑΜΑΤΕΟΜΑ
ΑΒΑΤΤΑ

ΙΨΤΕ ΜΟΦΨΤΨ: +ΡΓΓΕΙΑΜΑ+ΤΡΑ
ΤΕΚΑΚΒΕΤΕΒΑΜΑΕΜΑΡΑΨΕΤΕ

+ΡΕΥΤΤΒΕΛΕΜΑ ΝΑ +ΡΓΓΕΒΑΕΙΑΤΨΤΟ: ΑΓΞΕΤΑ ΤΓ
ΜΑΤΕΣΑΤΕ: ΓΡΕΝΑΡΨ: ΜΑΤΛΑΔΕΑΛΑΒ: ΠΞΤΡΞΙΝΕΑ

ΒΥΞΕΝΨΡΞΕΝΑΡΨΜΑΤΕΡΡΕ ΤΨ
ΟΡΤΤΕΙΡΜΑ+ΑΜΑ+ΕΔΕΡΑΨ ΤΟ+Ε
ΠΕΛΑΔΕΑΒΕ+ΙΑ

No. 35.

One letter is wanting at the beginning of each line, and there are other blanks and inaccuracies.

No. 36. *At Tlos, on the next Tomb to that on which is the Figure of Bellerophon represented by Mr. Fellows, p. 136.*

Mr. Forbes states that he believes the copy to be both exact and complete; nevertheless it may be suspected that we have only part of the inscription. The only intelligible words are the last, *sē lada eūwe, and his wife.*

2. "On the Reformation of the English Alphabet." By Danby Fry, Esq.

The author did not propose any new modes of spelling, but merely such additions to the alphabet as would enable it to express each elementary sound of our language by a distinct character. The circumstances of the times seem to require a more perfect alphabet. Military expeditions, and the yearly increasing circle of missionary or commercial enterprise, have brought us into contact with nations, with whom it must be alike our interest and our duty to cultivate the most intimate relations. The defects of our present alphabet oppose very serious obstacles to the acquisition of a new language, and thereby increase the difficulties which stand in the way of a more cordial intercourse between ourselves and distant races. We may form some notion how great these defects are from the ever-varying orthography made use of by our travellers when they have occasion to write the names of certain Eastern localities.

The sounds of our language which seem more particularly to require new characters to express them are, the greater number of the vowels, all the aspirated mutes except *f* and *v*, and the sound usually expressed by *ng*.

We have only five characters to express the six vowel-sounds, and no means whatever to distinguish their long from their short sound. The author would use the common mark indicating the long quantity, and would write:—

ā as heard in <i>fall</i> .				ā as heard in <i>father</i> .		
a	...	<i>folly</i> .		a	...	<i>fat</i> .
ō	...	<i>folk</i> .		ē	...	<i>feint</i> .
o	...	<i>son</i> .		e	...	<i>fen</i> .
ū	...	<i>rude</i> .		ī	...	<i>machine</i> .
u	...	<i>full</i> .		i	...	<i>fit</i> .

The diphthongs he would distinguish by the circumflex, writing *oi* as heard in *coin*, to distinguish it from the *oi* in *coincide*; *au* for the diphthongal sound in *foul*; *iū* for the diphthongal sound in *few*, and *ai* for that in *fine*.

For the two dental aspirates he proposed the use of the Anglo-

Saxon characters δ and ρ ; and for the two aspirates of the sibilant series, as heard in *azure* and *Ashur*, the characters γ and ʃh , writing *bishop* with the continuous character, but *mishap* with the two letters *s* and *h*. For the sound of *ng* as heard in *ring*, he proposed the character ʃg .

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

MARCH 8, 1844.

No. 19.

HENSLEIGH WEDGWOOD, Esq., in the Chair.

The following works were laid on the table :—

“ A Lexicon of *Æschylus*.” By the Rev. William Linwood, M.A., M.R.A.S., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. London 1843. Presented by the author.

“ *Æschyli Eumenides ad codicum manuscriptorum fidem recognovit, et notis maximam partem criticis instruxit Gulielmus Linwood, M.A., Ædis Christi Alumnus et Reg. Societ. Asiat. Soc. Accedunt viri summi Reverendi C. J. Blomfieldii, S.T.P. notæ mstæ. et aliorum selectæ.*” Oxford, 1844. Presented by the editor.

A report was read on the claims of Professor Christian Molbech of Copenhagen to be elected an honorary member of the Philological Society.

A paper was then read :—

“ On the Ellipsis, and on the Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun Personal in English Syntax,” by Edwin Guest, Esq.

An ellipsis is commonly said to be the omission of some word or words *necessary* to the construction of a sentence. It might perhaps be more satisfactory to call it a defective mode of expression, substituted for and originating in one more perfect. In such phrases as *ad Vestæ*, some word appears to have been dropped, in order to meet the wants of hurried conversation ; but in the phrase *dic mihi*, we have no reason to suppose that any part of the sentence has disappeared. It is true the verb has no subject, and that consequently the sentence is logically defective, but such a defect is of a very different kind from the one which was first noticed ; and the mischiefs arising from indefinite terms may perhaps be less than those which result from definitions so loose and general.

In the earlier stages of our language, the different persons of the verb were, most of them, readily distinguished by their inflexions ; but as these became gradually confounded and lost, other means of distinction became necessary, and the personal pronoun was more generally used as the subject of the verb. Use, however, seems to have stamped certain idioms too deeply into our language to be easily got rid of ; and we meet in almost every page of our dramatists with such phrases as, *thank you, beseech you, pray thee, cry your mercy, would it were so, &c.* In these idioms there may be reason to doubt if there be any real ellipsis. Similar forms may be found in the sister-dialects, and they may be traced to a period when the omission of the pronoun was almost as common in the Gothic as in the classical languages. Custom, however, has sanctioned the use of

possessive pronoun (which may be considered as representing the genitive) being found in the first clause, while the pronoun wanting in the second clause is the subject of the verb.

11. be north had fele affraies þorgh *the Scottis king*
be cuntre *gan* assail. R. Br. 88.
12. be ferthe sorow of þis land com þorgh be *Danes*,
be folk of the North *slouh*, *destroyed* þer wanes. R. Br. 8.
13. *þare* wekness is fulfilled, þer in *ere* waxed hard. R. Br. 66.
14. Unto *ourselves* it hapneth oft among,
In our own snares unluckily *are* caught,
Whilst our attempts fall instantly to nought.
Drayton's Cromwell.
15. This is *my* son beloved, in him *am* pleased. P. L. 12.
16. Into Lyndsay, brouht þei *him* tying
And purveied oste, and dight him als a douhty kyng.
R. Br. 27.
17. This thing was granted and *our* othes swore
With ful glad herte, *and praieden* also
That he wolde vouchesauf for to don so.
Chau. Prol.
18. *The Scottes and the Peightes* he drove into oute ysles
Of Scotland then *and there became* his men
To live in peace. Hard. Chron. Arthure.
19. —Owen Glendower—did great damage
For cause the Lord Graye held *his* heritage
And to the kyng of it full sore had playned
No remedie gate, so was he then demeaned.
Hard. Chron. 318.
20. . . . but a little wants of making *me* divine,
Nor barren *am* in brooks, for that I still retaine
Two neat and dainty rills. Polyolbion, 26.
21. Nor do we find *him* ready to be sounded,
But with a crafty madness *keeps* aloof
When we would bring him on to some confession
Of his true state. Hamlet, 3, 1.
22. Pech! *his* name is curt,
A monosyllable! *but commands* the horse well.
Ben Jons. New. Inn.
23. His honour'd presence so did *me* inflame,
That, though being then in presence of my peeres,
Daine not the lesse to meete him as he came, &c.
Drayt. Cromwell.

The verb is occasionally found without a subject when the pronoun, personal or possessive, occurs in the same clause. Such is not unfrequently the case with the reflexive verb. The omission has given rise to much curious idiom, and to some very false criti-

cism; but to discuss this syntax properly would require a more minute investigation than our present limits will admit of.

Sometimes the pronoun omitted is in the objective case.

24. Povertie ful often when a *man* is low,
 Maketh his God and eke himself to know.
 Chau. W. of Bathes Tale.
25. The one's *my* sovereign, whom both my oath
 And duty *bids* defend ; the other again
 Is *my* kinsman, whom the king hath wrong'd,
 Whom conscience and my kindred *bids* to right.
 Rich. II. 2. 2.
26. *Harald* was curteys and strong, of body avenaunt,
 To be þer king and hede þe lond was wele o grant.
 R. Br. 51.
27. 'tis a girl,
 Promises boys hereafter. Sir, your queen
 Desires *your* visitation, and to be
 Acquainted with this stranger. Henry VIII. 5. 1.
28. To beg of thee, it is *my* more dishonour
 Than thou of them. Cor. 3. 2.

The indeterminate pronoun was often omitted before the verb impersonal; and also in cases where an assertion was made simply by the verb substantive.

29. Now, said the lady, *draweth* towards night. F. Q. 1. 1. 22.
30. Forthwith on all sides to his aid *was run*
By angels many and strong. P. L. 6.
31. In holy churche of such a slitte,
Is for to rewe unto us alle. Gower, Conf. Am., fol. 2.
32. And a litel kyng *was*, whos sone was sick at Cafarnaum.—Wicl.
Ion. 4.
33. for drede thei crieden : and anon Jhesus spak to hem and
seide, Have ye trist, *I am*, nyle ye drede. And Peter answeride and seide,
Lord, if *thou art*, comaunde me to come to thee.—Wicl. Matt. 14.
34. *Shall not be* long, but I'll be here again. Macb. 4. 1.
35. that worthy prince, whose vertue I love and admire, though
my good destinie *hath not been* to see his person.—Pembr. Arc. 2.

This pronoun was also rarely if ever used, when a sentence or portion of a sentence filled the place of subject to the verb.

36. *He was a holy man, þorgh miracle was sene.—R. Br. 36.*
37. *pei said in þat parlement—
Pat Edward felle best be chefe, oþer shuld not falle.*
R. Br. 27.

The pronouns *he* and *it* were often used by Old-English writers, and sometimes even by later authors, as relatives.

38. The youth and inexperience of the prince, *he* was only fifteen years of age, declined a perilous encounter, &c.—Gibbon.

The omission of the relative, which is even yet so marked a feature in the language, is in fact only a particular case of the law we are now discussing. In present usage, the relative omitted is almost always the object of some verb, and the antecedent is generally preceded by the definite article—*he is the man I want*. Both these restrictions are of late introduction. In our earlier dialect the antecedent is often found otherwise accompanied, as, for example, by a possessive pronoun—

39. Their scouts convey'd away *my ships* they fande.
Higgins's King Humber, 8.

and till the close of the seventeenth century, the omitted relative was almost as often the subject as the object of the verb.

40. Sipe he went aboute kirkes vp to raise
Abbaies forto help, *were fallen* in miseyse. R. Br. 35.
41. Here now of *þer fyn*, *þam com* for *þat folie*. R. Br. 337.
42. Then to Philænes altars they attayn'd,
For so men call *two hills*, *erected are*
In Tunise land. Higgins's King Albanact, 32.
43. Farewell my country, Germany farewell—
Farewell my father, and *my friends*, *there dwell*.
Higgins's Queen Elatride, 43.
44. First wear this girdle, then appear
Invisible to *all are here*. Marlow, Dr. Faustus, 3, 2.
45. *Many* do keep their chambers, *are* not sick.
Tim. of A. 3. 4.

The relative often includes the antecedent, “*whom* he would he slew;” and sometimes we have it preceded by a preposition.

46. for *on whom we send*,
The weight of all, and our last hope relies. P. L. 2.

This idiom is occasionally found without the relative.

47. Take pittee *on a captive thrice hath beene*.
Higgins's Lady Sabrine, 18.

In Anglo-Saxon a pronoun was often placed before a noun, and more particularly before a proper name or name of dignity. The same construction was common in the Old-English.

48. thou poet Marcian,
That writest us that ilke weding mery
Of hire *Philologie* and *him Mercury*.
Chau. Marchantes Tale.
49. Who gaf Judith corage and hardenesse
To sleen *him Holofernes*, &c. M. of Lawes Tale.
50. All is his tombe not so curious
As was the tombe of *him Darius*,
Which that Apelles wrought so sotelly. W. of Bathes Prol.
51. O that the living Harry had the temper
Of *him the worst* of these three gentlemen.
H. IV. Part 2nd, 5. 2.

When the pronoun is the subject or object of the verb, the pronoun is generally placed before the verb, and the noun after it.

52. Of Gryme a fisshere men redes 3it in ryme,
þat *he* bigged Grymesby *Gryme* þat ilk tyme. R. Br. 26.
53. Harald of Donesmore vpon Done *him* mette
Vibrand, Dardanes brother. R. Br. 18.
54. Ac þo þe messinger *hym* sey þe *erl*, as hym þo3te
þat he hadde so foule ylow ful sore hym of þo3te. R. Gl. 160.
55. Engliche and Saxones þat hider were y broyt
þoru Brutones for to helpe hem, and seþþe *hem* ouercome
þe *Brutones*, þat hem hyder bro3te, &c. R. Glou. 3.
56. By whiche thei bound theim self by their sealing
Hym to delyuer *the kyng* his castels all,
To kepe to tyme his iudgement were byfall.
Hard. Chron. c. 158.

In another class of cases, the personal pronoun *follows* the noun, and when used as the subject or the object is generally found in immediate contact with the verb. Instances of this construction may be occasionally found even in modern English, when the noun is separated from its verb by a long interval (*Vide* the beginning of the Absolution, Common Prayer), and also when an emphasis is wanted.

57. Worthy Wolsey,
Who cannot err, *he* did it. H. VIII. 1. 1.

In the Old-English it seems to have been used, as it still is in the languages of northern Europe, as a mere idiom.

58. *Uttred* in his first yere messengers *he* sent. R. Br. 8.
59. The fift sorow þer after com whan *William Conqueroure*
þat aryued in þis land, Harold *he* slouh in stoure,
And barons oþer inouh, þat died in þe feld. R. Br. 8.
60. þe godes away þei ladde,
þat *men* with þe bestes in feldes þei þam fedde. Ib. 7.
61. Lordings the *time it wasteth* night and day
And steleth from us. Chau. M. of Lawes Prol.
62. *Duk Theseus*—with all his besy cure
He casteth now, wher that the sepulture
Of good Arcite may best ymaked be. Ch. Knightes Tale.
63. And *Custance* with a dedly pale face
The fourthe day toward the ship *she* went.
Chau. Man of Lawes Tale.
64. *And in thy sight to die* what were *it* else
But like a pleasant slumber, &c. H. VI. Part 2nd.

65. *general criticisms* concerning obscurity, &c., as in some cases there may be ground for them, so in others *they* may be nothing more than, &c.—Butler's Sermons, Pref.

In the following examples the pronoun is in the dative or in the accusative case.

66. *Edgare* —
His barons gaf *him* conseile for to tak a wyfe. R. Br. 35.
67. And *Absolon him* felle ne bet ne wers. Ch. Milleres Tale.
68. Bothe *he and Reynald*, was Guthefrides sonne—
He exilde þam out of the north. R. Br. 33.
69. to Danmark Kebriht gan schake,
þat þe kyng *Kebriht* ne myght *him* ouertake. Ib. 10.
70. Ine was kyng of Westsex sex and thretty ȝers
Iuor and Ini ost, did he þam chace. Ib. 6.
71. But *my servant Caleb*, because, &c., *him* will I bring into the land,
&c.—Numbers 14. 24.
72. *He* that hath killed my kyng, &c.....
..... is't not perfect conscience
To quit *him* with this arm? Hamlet, 5. 2.

The pronoun is sometimes found in the genitive case.

73. thei dred no þing God, no ȝemed euenhed of lawe
Bot *felawes unto þeses*, to robbours of ilk cuntre
þar *wikkedness* was fulfilled. R. Br. 65.
74. *This knight*, of which my tale is specially,
Whan that he saw he might not come thereby
(This is to sayn what women loven most)
Within his brest ful sorweful was *his gost*.
Chau. Wif. of Bathes Tale.
75. *This knight*, too late *his manhood and his might*
I did essay. F. Q. 4. 1. 35.
76. *my second joy*
And first fruits of my body, from *his presence*
I am barr'd as one infectious. W. Tale, 3. 1.

When the pronoun followed the noun immediately an idiom was the result, which has given rise to much speculation.

77. þe kyng tok *Brut ys owne body*, in ostage as it were.
R. Gl. 13.
78. Eldal þat bischop of Gloucestre was
And þe *erl ys broþer* Eldol was þer bi cas. Ib. 161.
79. Once in a sea-fight gainst the *Count his gallies*
I did some service. Tw. Night, 3. 3.

Addison, it is well known, considered this idiom as the origin of our genitive, and that the inflexion *s* represented “the *his* and *her* of our forefathers.” *Spect.* 135. Ben Jonson had taken a different view, and thought that the genitival ending *is* “brought in first the monstrous syntax of the pronoun *his* joining with a noun.”—*Gr. c.* 13. The confusion, however, between this syntax and the genitive appears to have originated at an earlier period. In the MS. of Rob. of Gloucester we have both forms, *Hengestes** and *Hengest ys*, and

* The form *Hengeste's*, which is sometimes found in Hearne's edition of Rob. of Gloucester, does not occur in the MS. It is one of those miserable “corrections” of which our editors are so proud, and their readers, for the most part, so impatient.

in some other MSS. of the fourteenth century, the latter of these forms seems to be used *exclusively*, as if the writer considered it to be the real representative of the genitive.

It may be well to notice, that the form which we are now discussing was just as common in the Dutch as in our own language. It survived indeed to so late a period, that modern Dutch grammarians sometimes think it necessary to warn the reader against such phrases as "*mijne moeder hare zuster*," my mother her sister; "*mijn vader zijn broeder*," my father his brother, &c.

When the pronoun was used as the object of the verb, the noun appears to have been treated, for the most part, as a nominative absolute. See Ex. 68, 72. The Latin (in which these idioms were almost as common as in English, *Voss. de Constr.* c. 59.) sometimes tolerated a similar construction: "*Cæteræ philosophorum disciplinæ, eas nihil adjuvare arbitror*." *Cicero*. But the more general practice seems to have been to put noun and pronoun in the same case: "*Corporis nostri magnam natura ipsa videtur habuisse rationem, quæ formam nostram, reliquamque figuram, in quâ esset species honesta, eam posuit in promptu; quæ partes autem*," &c. *Cicero*. This latter syntax is also found in English.

80. Godwyn an erle of Kent met with Alfred,
Him and alle his feres vntille prison þam led,
 Of some smote of her hedes, &c. R. Br. 52.
81. *Your majestie and me*, that have free souls,—
 It touches *us* not. Hamlet, 3. 2.

When the pronoun is in the genitive or dative case, a preposition is sometimes placed before the noun.

82. — a lorde of honour,
Of Helianoure schip, he was hire governour. R. Br. 153.
83. Sathan that ever us waiteth to beguile
Saw of Custance all hire perfection. Ch. M. of Lawes Tale.
84. He ordeyned then by statute ordinaunce
 That none should bee the prince of Wales more
Excepte of the King his eldest sonne ferst bore.
 Hard. Chron. 297.
85. ——— erle and baroun
To Eilred Edgar sonne bitought *him* þe coroune. R. Br. 37.
86. *To þe folk* þat duelled Acres forto fende
Oþer fwe þousand marke he gaf þam to spende. Ib. 135.

In the Gothic, as in some of the Shemitic, dialects, we have occasionally a personal pronoun coupled with the relative. The German affords us a familiar example of this usage, "*Vater unser der du bist im himmel*, &c." Our Father that—thou art in heaven, &c. In the Anglo-Saxon and Old-English we meet with a very similar syntax, which even yet can hardly be considered as altogether obsolete.

87. A knight ther was and that a worthy man
That fro the time that he ferste bigan
 To riden out, *he* loved chivalrie. Chau. Knightes Tale.

88. I pawn'd
Mine honour for his truth, *who* being so heighten'd,
He water'd his new plants with dews of flattery,
Seducing so my friends. Cor. 5. 5.
89. — lend it rather to thy enemy,
Who if *he* break, thou may'st with better grace
Exact the penalty. M. of Venice, 1. 2.
90. — the winter's wind,
Which, when *it* bites and blows upon my body
Even till I shrink with cold, I smile, and say,
"This is no flattery." As You Like It, 2. 1.

91. Outward senses, mental faculties, health of body, and peace of mind are extremely valuable; but the continuance of them for a single moment depends upon him, *who*, if *he* opens none can shut, and if he shuts none can open.—I. Newton's Letter to a Nobleman, 8.

The personal pronoun sometimes appears as the object of the verb.

92. I saw to day a corps yborne to cherche
That now on Monday last I saw *him* werche.
Chau. Milleres Tale.
93. Anger is like
A full hot horse, *who* being allow'd his way,
Self-mettle tires *him*. H. VIII. 1. 1.

In these cases, the relative appears to be a nominative absolute. See Ex. 88, 89, 91, 93; and instead of *who*, *which*, &c., we might substitute *respecting whom*, *respecting which*, &c. The relative is sometimes used as such nominative absolute, without being coupled with any pronoun personal.

94. Her frights and griefs,
Which never tender lady hath borne greater. W. Tale, 2. 1.

95. — those only are judges, &c. who will be at the trouble, &c. to see how far the things here insisted upon (and not other things) might have been put in a plainer manner; *which* yet I am very far from asserting that they could not. Butler's Sermons, Pref.

The use of the relative as a nominative absolute is still not uncommon in our provincial dialects. Mr. Cornwall Lewis, in his Herefordshire Glossary, mentions *which* as "used in Gloucestershire with a sense between a conjunction and a relative." He gives the following examples: "He told the landlord to bring him some beer, *which* he drawed it, and brought it to him." "He said I went to Gloucester yesterday, *which* I did no such thing." "I gave him two shillings yesterday, *which* I have given him five shillings a week ever since our last vestry meeting."

In some few instances, however, the relative seems (like the noun in Ex. 80, 81,) to have taken the same case as the pronoun personal.

96. But an hired hyne, and that is not the schepherde, *whos* ben not the sheep *his* own, seeth a wolfe comynge and leeneth the sheep.—Wicliff, Ion. x.

It may be observed that we sometimes have the relative in one clause of the sentence, and the pronoun personal in another.

97. ——— thilke bodye fat
Whiche thei with deintee meates kepe
 And laien *it* softe for to slepe, &c.
 Gower, Conf. Am. fol. 3.

98. ——— t'her whom the first man did wive
 (*Whom* and *her* race only forbiddings drive)
 He gave it. Donne, Pr. of the Soule, 9.

99. ——— false prophets *which* come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly *they* are ravening wolves.—Matt. 13. 21.

This anomaly may perhaps be explained, by supposing an ellipsis of the relative—"which come to you, &c., but *which*, inwardly they are ravening wolves."

There yet remains an idiom which should not pass altogether without notice. When a subordinate clause acts the part of object to a verb, the syntax is sometimes altered by making the subject of such clause the object, and filling up its place with a pronoun personal. This resembles a well-known Greek idiom.

100. That all the people of the earth might know *the hand of the Lord*, that *it* is mighty.—Josh. 4. 24.

101. Fate hear *me*, what *I* say. Tr. and Cr. 5. 6.
 102. I see *you*, what *you* are; you are too proud. Tw. Night, 1. 5.
 103. Conceal *me* what *I* am. Tw. Night, 1. 2.
 104. I was then present ———
 Beheld *them*, when they lighted, how *they* clung
 In their embracement, &c. H. VIII. 1. 1.

No. 18 will be ready in a few days.

On Friday, March 22, a paper will be read "On the Interpretation of the Greek Idiom, which arises from combining *ἵνα*, *ὅπως*, *ὥς* with the Past Indicative." By the Rev. O. Cockayne.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

MARCH 22, 1844.

No. 20.

Professor WILSON in the Chair.

The following papers were read:—

1. "On the Construction of *ἵνα*, *ὅπως*, *ὥς*, with the Past Indicative." By the Rev. O. Cockayne.

The following paper is submitted to the Society with the hope of explaining more fully the principles on which is founded the construction of *ἵνα*, *ὅπως*, *ὥς*, with the past indicative, as *ἵνα εἶχον*.

Dr. Monk in his *Hippolytus* has collected some instances of this usage, and has allowed us to discover his principle of interpretation by translating *ἵν' εἶχον*, "*in which case they would be able.*" Though the *Hippolytus* was published more than thirty years ago, yet this interpretation will fairly form the subject-matter for discussion even now, because the high reputation of Dr. Monk as a classical scholar has given his opinion a general reception in England, and it is still inculcated in our public schools and books.

Now in this interpretation is implied, that *ἵνα* in such idioms denotes circumstance, "*in which case,*" and consequently, that it is here used as a local particle.

To this hypothesis may be opposed several considerations.

1. When the local particle *ἵνα* is used with the past indicative, the verb retains the indicative sense; as

Hecuba 100. Ἐκάβη, σπουδῇ πρὸς σ' ἐλιάσθην,
τὰς δεσποσύνας σκήνας προλιποῦσ',
ἵν' ἐκληρώθην καὶ προσετάχθην
δούλην.

"where I *was* allotted and appointed to servitude."

2. The other local particles, *ὅπου*, *ἐνθα*, are not so used.
3. *ἵνα*, *ὅπως*, *ὥς*, all obtain place in this construction, and are all final particles.
4. The analogy of other particles with the indicative past.

<i>εἶποιμι ἂν</i> ,	<i>dicerem</i> ,
<i>εἶπον ἂν</i> ,	<i>dixissem</i> ,
<i>εἰ εἶποιμι</i> ,	<i>si dicerem</i> ,
<i>εἰ εἶπον</i> ,	<i>si dixissem</i> ,
<i>εἴθ' εἶποιμι</i> ,	<i>utinam dicerem</i> ,
<i>εἴθ' εἶπον</i> ,	<i>utinam dixissem</i> , &c.

5. The suitableness of the signification *UT*, *that*, to all the genuine examples.

Again, the translation, "*might be able,*" is not discriminating. The

true and distinctive signification of the expression we are examining is to be expressed by the pluperfect in English. And it obtains in like manner with other particles, as noticed above: *εἶπον ἂν*, pluperfect, "*I should have said*;" *ἔγωγ' ἂν εἶπον, εἰ παρὼν ἐτύγγχανον*, Ecclesiāz. 407, pluperf. "*If I had been present*;" *εἴθε με Καδμείων στίχες ἦναρον ἐν κονίαισιν*, Eur. Suppl. 821, pluperf. "*I wish they had killed*;" and similarly *ἵνα εἶχον*, "*that they might have been able*," pluperfect.

The following propositions are therefore submitted as the more probable solution:

1. *ἵνα, ὅπως, ὥς*, are here final particles and not local.
2. The signification of *ἵνα, ὅπως, ὥς εἶχον*, depending on a contingent clause, is also contingent, and to be expressed in English by the pluperfect.
3. The signification of the clause on which *ἵνα, ὅπως, ὥς*, in this sense depend, is always in like manner pluperfect, and either contingent or expressive of a wish.
4. The tense is either aorist, imperfect (as *ἵνα εἶχον*), or a pluperfect partaking of an imperfect sense: as *ἐκαθήμην*, from *κάθημαι*, I sit, *ἦδεν*, from *οἶδα*, I know.
5. The laws that govern the use of *ἵνα, ὅπως, ὥς*, are closely analogous with those relating to *εἰ, if*.

The examples that follow embrace all those referred to by Dr. Monk, together with others: they are used here merely as illustrations: it is not intended to prove the principle by the translations, but merely to show that the examples do not negative the hypothesis now proposed.

The first class of passages consists of those in which the prior clause expresses a contingency by the use of *ἂν*. Lysias adv. Simona, p. 98. § 21. *ἐβουλόμην δ' ἂν, ὡς βουλή, Σίμωνα τὴν αὐτὴν ἐμοὶ γνώμην ἔχειν*, "IN' ἀμφοτέρων ἡμῶν ἀκούσαντες τὰληθῆ ῥαδίως ἔγνωτε τὰ δίκαια," "*I should have wished my adversary to do so also, that you might have easily determined on which side justice lies*." Lysias de Nece Eratosth. p. 95. § 40. *εἶτα δοκῶ ἂν ὑμῖν τὸν συνδειπινοῦντα ἀφεῖς μόνος καταλειφθῆναι καὶ ἔρημος γενέσθαι, ἣ κελεύειν ἐκείνον μένειν*, "INA μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν μοιχὸν ἐτιμωρεῖτο;" "*was it not more likely I should have requested my friend to stay, that he might have helped me?*" Lysias de Vulnere, p. 101. § 3. *ἐβουλόμην δ' ἂν μὴ ἀπολαχεῖν αὐτὸν κριτὴν Διονυσίοις*, "INA ὑμῖν φανερὸς ἐγένετο ἐμοὶ διηλλαγμένος, κρίνας τὴν ἐμὴν φυλὴν νικᾶν," "*I should have wished him one of the umpires, that you might have seen him award the prize to my tribe*." Demosth. c. Aphob. fals. test. p. 849. § 17. *τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἂν ἐλέγξαι ζητῶν ἐξήγησεν ἂν με τὸν παῖδα τὸν γράφοντα τὰς μαρτυρίας*, "IN' εἰ μὴ παρεδίδουν μηδὲν δίκαιον λέγειν ἐδόκουν," "*he would have demanded my slave, that if I had refused, I might have been suspected of a false statement*." Ecclesiāz. 151. *ἐβουλόμην μὲν ἕτερον ἂν τῶν ἡθάρων λέγειν τὰ βέλτισθ' ἵνα ἐκαθήμην ἡσυχος*, "*I should have preferred some one else had spoken, that I might have been spared the trouble*."

Œdipus Tyr. 1386. ——— ἀλλ' εἰ τῆς ἀκουούσης ἔτ' ἦν
 πηγῆς δι' ὧτων φραγμός, οὐκ ἂν ἐσχόμην
 τὸ μὴ ποκλείσαι τοῦμόν ἄθλιον δέμας,
 "IN' ἦν τυφλός τε καὶ κλύων μηδέν,

"Had it been possible I *would have deprived* myself of hearing, that I *might have been* of sounds unconscious also."

Iph. Taur. 355. ἀλλ' οὔτε πνεῦμα Διόθεν ἦλθε πώποτε
 οὐ πορθμῖς, ἥτις διὰ πέτρας Συμπληγάδας
 Ἑλένην ἂν ἤγαγ' ἐνθάδ', ἢ μ' ἀπώλεσε,
 Μενέλεων θ', "IN' αὐτοὺς ἀντετιμωρήσάμην,

"No vessel came, that *might have brought* them, that I *might have been avenged*."

In the following passage the construction is somewhat altered by the use of the impersonal participle absolute. Lysias de Olea Sacra, p. 109. § 17.—πῶς ἂν ἐτόλμησα τοσούτων μεμισθωμένων καὶ ἀπάντων συνειδότην ἀφανίσαι τὸν σηκόν, βραχέος μὲν κέρδους ἔνεκα, προθεσμίας δὲ οὐδεμιᾶς οὔσης τῷ κινδύνῳ, τοῖς εἰργασμένοις ἅπασιν τὸ χωρίον ὁμοίως προσῆκον εἶναι σῶον τὸν σηκόν, "IN', εἴ τις αὐτοὺς ἠτιᾶτο, εἶχον ἀνευεγκεῖν ὄτῳ παρέδοσαν; "How *should I have dared* to meddle with the consecrated plat of ground, when it *would have been* the interest of every successive tenant to show he left it unimpaired, in order that, if called in question, he thus *might have been* able to lay the blame on the next occupier?"

Andokides de Reditu, p. 22, § 21. ἐδεξάμην δ' ἂν πάντων χρημάτων εἶναι ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ φράσαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἃ καὶ τῇ βουλῇ ἐν ἀπορήτῳ εἰσήγγειλα, "ΟΠΩΣ αὐτόθεν προήδειτε. "I *would have given* all the world to tell you, that you *might have known*."

Demosth. pro Phormione, p. 950, § 20. τίς οὐκ ἂν—τούτῳ ταῦτ' ἐδήλωσεν, "ΟΠΩΣ διὰ τούτου ταῦτα ἠλέγχθη; "Who *would not have given* information to Pasikles, that the offence *might have been discovered* by his means?"

The passages next to be adduced are those in which the principal clause is expressed by EXPHN or the like.

Hippolyt. 645. XPHN δ' ἐς γυναῖκα πρόσπολον μὲν οὐ περᾶν,
 ἄφθογγα δ' αὐτοῖς συγκατοκίζειν δάκη
 θηρῶν, "IN' εἶχον μήτε προσφωνεῖν τινα,
 μητ' ἐξ ἐκείνων φθέγμα δέξασθαι πάλιν.

"Women *ought to have been surrounded* with dumb creatures, that they *might have had* no opportunity."

Isokrates Evagoras, p. 189, § 5. EXPHN μὲν οὖν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπαινεῖν τοὺς ἐφ' αὐτῶν ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς γεγεννημένους, "IN' οἳ τε δυνάμενοι τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἔργα κοσμεῖν ἐν εἰδόσι ποιούμενοι τοὺς λόγους ταῖς ἀληθείαις ἐχρῶντο περὶ αὐτῶν, οἳ τε νεώτεροι φιλοτιμοτέρως διέκειντο πρὸς τὴν ἀρετήν. "It *would have been well* had able writers chosen contemporaries for the objects of their praise, that they *might have been compelled* to adhere to the truth, and that an example *might have been proposed* for the imitation of the young."

Plato Protag. § 64. p. 335 C. ἀλλά σε EXPHN ἡμῖν συγχωρεῖν τὸν ἀμφοτέρα δυνάμενον, "INA συνουσία ἐγίγινετο. "You who can do

both *ought to have conceded*, that we *might have entered upon conversation*."

Demosth. adv. Aphob. p. 837, § 5. ἀλλ' ΕΧΡΗΝ ἐπειδὴ τάχιστ' ἐτελεύτησεν ὁ πατήρ, εἰσκαλέσαντας μάρτυρας πολλοὺς παρασημῆ-
νισθαι κελεῦσαι τὰς διαθήκας, "IN' εἴ τι ἐγίγνετο ἀμφισβητήσιμον, ἦν
εἰς τὰ γράμματα, ταῦτ' ἐπανελθεῖν. "The right course *would have been*
to verify all the testamentary papers, that these *might have been* an
authority to which to appeal."

Pax, 135. οὐκ οὐν ΕΧΡΗΝ σε Πηγάσου ζευξαι πτερὸν,
"ΟΠΩΣ ἐφαίνον τοῖς θεοῖς τραγικώτερος ;

"*Would it not have been better* to put the stage Pegasus into harness;
that you *might have appeared* with greater effect?"

Hippolyt. 925. ΧΡΗΝ—δισσὰς φωνὰς ἔχειν,
"ΩΣ ἡ φρονούσα τᾶδ' ἐξηλέγχετο
πρὸς τῆς δικαίας, οὐκ ἂν ἠπατώμεθα.

"It *would have been* well had men two tones of voice, that falsehood
might have been tried by the test of truth."

In some places the prior clause is left to the imagination, or rather
instinct, of the hearer.

Plato, Euthydem. p. 304 E. § 77. καὶ μὴν, ἔφη, ἄξιόν γ' ἦν ἀκοῦσαι.
Τί δέ; ἦν δ' ἐγώ. "INΑ ἤκουσας ἀνδρῶν διαλεγομένων οἱ νῦν σοφώ-
τατοί εἰσι τῶν περὶ τοὺς τοιούτους λόγους. "That you *might have*
heard." Here the construction is not continuous: the premiss is
implied, "it would have been worth while to be near."

Hippol. prior, frag. xii. φεῦ. φεῦ. τὸ μὴ τὰ πράγματ' ἀνθρώποις ἔχειν
φωνήν, "IN' ἦσαν μηδὲν οἱ δεινοὶ λέγειν.

Here also the construction has suffered an ellipsis of the chief clause :
"Events ought to have told their own tale, that the artifices of rhe-
toric *might have been* useless. O ! that it is not so !"

We now pass to those instances in which the principal clause ex-
presses a wish.

Plato, Crito, P. 44. D. § 3. Εἰ γὰρ "ΩΦΕΛΟΝ, ὡς Κρίτων, οἰοί τε
εἶναι οἱ πολλοὶ τὰ μέγιστα κακὰ ἐξεργάζεσθαι, "INΑ οἰοί τε ἦσαν αὐ-
τὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ τὰ μέγιστα· καὶ καλῶς ἂν εἶχε. "I wish they had possessed
this power of mischief, that they *might also have been* able to confer
benefits."

Choephoros, 195. Εἰθ' εἶχε φωνὴν εὖφρον', ἀγγέλου δίκην,
"ΟΠΩΣ δὶφροντις οὐσα μὴ ἰκινυσσόμην.

"I wish it had been gifted with the power of speech that I *might*
not have been tossed with doubts."

Sophocl. Electr. 1131. ὥς "ΩΦΕΛΟΝ πάροιθεν ἐκλιπεῖν βίον,
πρὶν ἐς ξένην σε γαῖαν ἐκπέμψαι, χεροῖν
κλέψασα ταῖνδε, κάνασώσασθαι φόνου,
"ΟΠΩΣ θανὼν ἔκεισο τῇ τόθ' ἡμέρᾳ
τύμβου πατρώου κοινὸν εἰληχῶς μέρος.

"I wish that I had died rather, that you *might have been laid* in the
sepulchre of your fathers."

Hippol. 1078. "ΕΙΘ' ἦν ἐμαυτὸν προσβλέπειν ἐναντίον
στάνθ', Ὡς ἐδάκρυσ' οἷα πάσχομεν κακά.

"O! that I might have stood a spectator of my own woe, that I might have poured forth the tears of sympathy."

Prometh. Vinct. 152. Εἰ γὰρ μ' ὑπὸ γῆν νέρθεν τ' Ἀΐδου
τοῦ νεκροδέγμονος εἰς ἀπέραντον
Τάρταρον ἦκεν,
δεσμοῖς ἀλύτοις ἀγρίοις πελάσας,
Ὡς μήτε θεὸς μήτε τις ἄλλος
τοῖσδ' ἐγεγήθει.

"O! that he had doomed me to the depths of Tartarus, that no one might have rejoiced."

Theocr. vii. 286. Αἰθ' ἐπ' ἐμεῦ ζωῖς ἐναρίθμιος Ὡφέλες ἦμεν
Ὡς τοι ἐγὼν ἐνόμενον ἀν' ὥρεα τὰς καλὰς αἶγας
φωνᾶς εἰσαΐων· τὸ δ' ὑπὸ δρυσὶν ἢ ὑπὸ πεύκαις
ἀδὺ μελισδόμενος κατεκέκλισο, θεῖε Κομαία.

"I wish you had lived in my time, that I might have pastured your goats for you, and that you might have lain."

To the same class of expressions we may refer the following.

Prom. 749. Τί δῆτ' ἐμοὶ ζῆν κέρδος, ἀλλ' ΟΥΚ ἐν τάχει
ἔρριψ' ἐμαυτὴν τῇσδ' ἀπὸ στύφλου πέτρας,
Ὅπῳ πέδῳ σκήψασα τῶν πάντων πόνων
ἀπηλλάγην;

"O! that I had precipitated myself, that I might have been rid."

Œdip. Tyr. 1391. ἰὼ Κιθαιρῶν, τί μ' ἐδέχον; Τί μ' ΟΥ λαβὼν
ἐκτεινας εὐθὺς, Ὡς ἔδειξα μήποτε
ἐμαυτὸν ἀνθρώποισιν ἐνθεν ἦν γεγώς;

"O! that I had died upon the mountain, that this might never have been told!"

Theocr. xi. 54. ὦμοι ὅτ' ΟΥΚ ἔτεκέν μ' ἂ μάτηρ βράγχι' ἔχοντα
Ὡς κατέδυν ποτι τίν, καὶ τὰν χέρα τεύς ἐφίλασα.

"O! that I had been a fish, that I might have dived and might have kissed."

A few passages have been referred to this construction which do not really belong to it: e. g. Phœnissæ, 213. ἵνα κατενάσθην, the true reading is with Dindorf, ἵνα κατενάσθη, "where the temple has been erected for his residence."

After what has been said we may venture to suggest an emendation of Lysias adv. Simona, p. 100. § 44. ἐβουλόμην δ' ἂν ἐξεῖναι μοι παρ' ὑμῖν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιδείξαι τὴν τούτου πονηρίαν, ἵνα ἡπίστασθε—where the usual reading is ἐπίστησθε.

In the discussion which followed Professor Malden observed, that the particular construction under consideration belonged to a general law of the Greek language, by which, if actions or events, present or past, were assumed to be different from what they really were, whether in an hypothesis, or a wish, or any other form, such an

hypothesis or wish was expressed by a past tense of the Indicative mood; and in like manner any consequence following from it was expressed by a past Indicative with the particle *ἄν*; and in all dependent clauses of all sorts attached to such sentences, only the Indicative Mood in past tenses could be used; and the Subjunctive or Optative Mood never entered into the construction. He also objected to the indiscriminate translation by the English Pluperfect, "might have," &c. In hypotheses and wishes contrary to actual fact, with relation to *past* time, the Indicative Aorist was used of single acts, and the past Imperfect of continued acts; and these forms were rightly translated by the English Pluperfect; but with relation to *present* time the Imperfect was always used, and this construction could not, in correct English, be translated by the Pluperfect, *e. g.* Dem. Phil. I. εἰ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ παρεληλυθότος χρόνου τὰ δέοντα οὗτοι συνεβούλευσαν, οὐδὲν ἂν ὑμᾶς νῦν ἔδει βουλεύεσθαι.—"For if these men *had given* the needful counsels in time past, there *would not be* any need *now* for you to be consulting."

The same distinction was frequently observable in dependent clauses following *ἵνα*, *ὅπως*, &c. While in CEd. T. v. 1392, ὥς ἔδειξα μήποτε was rightly translated, "so that I might never have shown;" in v. 1389, ἵν' ἦν τυφλός τε καὶ κλύων μηδὲν, would be better translated, "that I might be (*i. e.* at the time of speaking) both blind and deaf*."

2. "On the Reciprocal Pronouns, and on the Reciprocal Power of the Reflective Verb." By Professor Latham.

The present paper is upon the reciprocal pronouns, and upon certain forms of the verb used in a reciprocal sense. It is considered that these points of language have not been put forwards with that prominence and care which their value in the solution of certain problems in Philology requires. Too often the terms Reciprocal and Reflective have been made synonymous. How far this is true may be determined by the fact that the middle verbs in the Icelandic language have been called by so great a philologist as Rask *reciprocal* instead of *reflective*. This is equivalent to treating sentences like *we strike ourselves*, and *we strike each other*, as identical. Yet the language with which Rask was dealing (the Icelandic) was the one of all others wherein the difference in question required to be accurately drawn, and fully pointed out. (See 'Anvisning till Isländskan,' pp. 281, 283.)

* So in Choeph. v. 195. εἴθ' εἶχε φωνήν
ὅπως δίφροντις οὔσα μὴ 'κινυσσόμην.

"Would that it had a voice, that I might not be tossed with doubts!" But the main point is to remember the law of the construction compared with the construction of the Subjunctive and Optative Moods:

ρίψω ἐμαυτήν, ὅπως ἀπαλλαγῶ (subj.).
ῥρίψεν ἐαυτήν, ὅπως ἀπαλλαγείη (opt.).

but (in Prom. v. 749), τί οὐκ ῥρίψα ἐμαυτήν (equivalent to a wish contrary to the fact), ὅπως ἀπηλλάγην (indicative).—H. M.

In all sentences containing the statement of a reciprocal or mutual action there are in reality two assertions, viz. the assertion that A *strikes* (or *loves*) B, and the assertion that B *strikes* (or *loves*) A; the action forming one, the reaction another. Hence, if the expression exactly coincided with the fact signified, there would always be two propositions. This, however, is not the habit of language. Hence arises a more compendious form of expression, giving origin to an ellipsis of a peculiar kind. Phrases like *Eteocles and Polynices killed each other* are elliptical for *Eteocles and Polynices killed—each the other*. Here the second proposition expands and explains the first, whilst the first supplies the verb to the second. Each, however, is elliptic. The first is without the object, the second without the verb. That the verb must be in the plural (or dual) number, that one of the nouns must be in the nominative case, and that the other must be objective, is self-evident from the structure of the sentence; such being the conditions of the expression of the idea. An aposiopesis takes place after a plural verb, and then there follows a clause wherein the verb is supplied from what went before.

When words equivalent to *each other* coalesce, and become compound, it is evident that the composition is of a very peculiar kind. Less, however, for these matters than for its value in elucidating the origin of certain deponent verbs does the expression of reciprocal action merit the notice of the philologist. In the latter part of the paper it will appear that for one branch of languages, at least, there is satisfactory evidence of a reflective form having become reciprocal, and of a reciprocal form having become deponent; this latter word being the term for those verbs whereof the meaning is active, and the form passive.

Beginning with those methods of denoting mutual action where the expression is the least explicit and unequivocal, it appears that in certain languages the reciprocal character of the verb is implied rather than expressed. *Each man looked at his brother*—or some equivalent clause, is the general phraseology of the Semitic languages.

More explicit than this is the use of a single pronoun (personal, possessive, or reflective) and of some adverb equivalent to the words *mutually, interchangeably, &c.* This is the habit of the Latin language,—*Eteocles et Polynices invicem se trucidaverunt*: also of the French, although not invariably, e. g. *s'entr'aimer, s'entre dire, s'entre battre*: also of the Mæso-Gothic—*galeikái sind barnam tháim vōp-jandam seina missó* = ὁμοιοί εἰσι παιδίοις τοῖς προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις = loquentibus ad invicem.—Luc. vii. 32. Deutsche Grammatik, iv. 322, and iii. 13. The Welsh expressions are of this kind; the only difference being that the adverb coalesces with the verb, as an inseparable particle, and so forms a compound. These particles are *dym, cym, or cy* and *ym*. The former is compounded of *dy*, signifying *iteration*, and *ym* denoting *mutual action*; the latter is the Latin *cum*. Hence the reciprocal power of these particles is secondary: e. g. *dymborthi*, to aid mutually; *dymddadlu*, to dispute; *dymgaru*, to love one another; *dymgoddi*, to vex one another; *dymgredu*, to

trust one another, or confide; *dymguraw*, to strike one another, or fight; *cyfweennys*, to desire mutually; *cydadnabod*, to know one another; *cydaddawiad*, to promise mutually; *cydwystlaw*, to pledge; *cydymadrawn*, to converse; *cydymdaith*, to accompany; *ymadroddi*, to discourse; *ymaddaw*, to promise; *ymavael*, to struggle; *ymdaeru*, to dispute, &c.

The form, which is at once current, full, and unequivocal, is the one that occurs in our own, and in the generality of languages. Herein there are two nouns (generally pronouns), and the construction is of the kind exhibited above—*ἀλλήλους*, *each other*, *einander*, *l'un l'autre*, &c.

Sometimes the two nouns remain separate, each preserving its independent form. This is the case in most of the languages derived from the Latin, in several of the Slavonic and Lithuanic dialects, and in (amongst others) the Old Norse, the Swedish, and the Danish,—*l'un l'autre*, French; *uno otro*, Span.; *geden druheho*, Bohemian; *ieden drugiego*, Polish; *wiens wienâ*, Lith.; *weens ohtru*, Lettish; *hvert annan* (masc.), *hvert annat* (neut.), Old Norse. See D. G. iii. 84.

Sometimes the two nouns coalesce and form words to which it would be a mere refinement to deny the name of compounds: this is the case with the Greek—*ἀλλήλων*, *ἀλλήλοις*, *ἀλλήλους*.

Sometimes it is doubtful whether the phrase consist of a compound word or a pair of words. This occurs where, from the want of inflection, the form of the first word is the same in composition as it would have been out of it. Such is the case with our own language: *each-other*, *one-another*.

Throughout the mass of languages in general the details of the expression in question coincide; both subject and object are almost always expressed by pronouns, and these pronouns are much the same throughout. *One*, or some word equivalent, generally denotes the subject. *Other*, or some word equivalent, generally denotes the object, *e. g.* they struck *one another*. The varieties of expression may be collected from the following sketch:—

a. The subject is expressed by *one*, or some word equivalent, in most of the languages derived from the Latin, in several of the Slavonic dialects, in Lithuanic and Lettish, in Armenian, in German, in English, and doubtlessly in many other languages—*l'un l'autre*, Fr.; *uno otro*, Sp.; *ieden drugiego*, Polish; *wiens wienâ*, Lith.; *weens ohtru*, Lith.; *me mæants*, Armenian; *einander*, Germ.; *one another*, Engl.

b. By *each*, or some equivalent term, in English, Dutch, and the Scandinavian languages—*each other*, English; *elkander*, Dutch; *hverandre*, Icelandic, Danish, Swedish.

c. By *this*, or some equivalent term, in Swedish and Danish (*hinanden*); in Lithuanic (*kitts kittâ*), and in Lettish (*zitts zittu*).

d. By *other*, or some equivalent term, in Greek and Armenian; *ἀλλήλους*, *irærats*.

e. By *man*, used in an indefinite sense and compounded with *lik* in Dutch, *malkander* (*mal-lik manlik*).

f. By a term equivalent to *mate* or *fellow* in Laplandic—*gòim gòimeme*.—Rask, 'Lappisk Sproglære,' p. 102. Stockfleth, 'Grammatik,' p. 109.

a. In the expression of the object the current term is *other* or some equivalent word. Of this the use is even more constant than that of *one* expressive of the subject—*l'un l'autre*, French; *uno otro*, Spanish; *ἀλλήλους*, Greek; *geden druheho*, Bohemian; *ieden drugiego*, Polish; *weens ohtru*, Lettish; *irærats*, Armenian; *einander*, German; each *other*, one *another*, English.

b. In Lithuanic the term in use is *one*; as, *wiens wiend*. The same is the case for a second form in the Armenian *mimæan*.

c. In Laplandic it is denoted in the same as the subject; as *gòim gòimeme*.

Undoubtedly there are other varieties of this general method of expression. Upon those already exhibited a few remarks, however, may be made.

1. In respect to languages like the French, Spanish, &c., where the two nouns, instead of coalescing, remain separate, each retaining its inflection, it is clear that they possess a greater amount of perspicuity; inasmuch as (to say nothing of the distinction of gender) the subject can be used in the singular number when the mutual action of two persons (*i. e.* of *one* upon *another*) is spoken of, and in the plural when we signify that of more than two; e. g. *ils* (*i. e.* A and B) *se battaient*—*l'un l'autre*: but *ils* (A, B, C and D,) *se battaient*—*les uns les autres*. This degree of perspicuity might be attained in English and other allied languages by reducing to practice the difference between the words *each* and *one*; in which case we might say *A and B struck one another*, but *A, B and C struck each other*. In the Scandinavian languages this distinction is real; where *hinanden* is equivalent to *l'un l'autre*, French; *un otro*, Spanish: whilst *hverandre* expresses *les uns les autres*, French; *unos otros*, Spanish. The same is the case in the Laplandic. See Rask's 'Lappisk Sproglære,' p. 102.

2. An analysis of such an expression as *they praise one another's* (or *each other's*) *conduct*, will show the lax character of certain forms in the Swedish. Of the two pronouns it is only the latter that appears in an oblique case, and this necessarily; hence the Swedish form *hvarsannars* is illogical. It is precisely what *one's another's* would be in English, or *ἄλλων ἄλλων* for *ἀλλήλων* in Greek. The same applies to the M. H. G. *einen anderen*. D. G. iii. 83.

3. The term expressive of the object appears in three forms, viz. preceded by the definite article (*l'un l'autre*), by the indefinite article (*one another*), and finally, standing alone (*each other*, *einander*). Of these three forms the first is best suited for expressing the reciprocal action of two persons (one out of two struck the other); whilst the second or third is fittest for signifying the reciprocal action of more than two (one out of many struck, and was struck by, some other).

The third general method of expressing mutual or reciprocal action is by the use of some particular form of the verb. In two, and pro-

bably more, of the African languages (the Woloff and Bechuana) this takes place. In the Turkish there is also a reciprocal form : as *sui-mek*, to love ; *baki-mek*, to look ; *sui-sh-mek*, to love one another ; *baki-sh-mek*, to look at one another ; *su-il-mek*, to be loved ; *sui-sh-il-mek*, to be loved mutually.—*David's Turkish Grammar*.

The fourth form of expression gives the fact alluded to at the beginning of the paper: viz. an instrument of criticism in investigating the origin of certain deponent verbs. In all languages there is a certain number of verbs denoting actions, reciprocal or mutual to the agents. Such are the words *embrace*, *converse*, *strive against*, *wrestle*, *fight*, *rival*, *meet*, and several more. There are also other words where the existence of two parties is essential to the idea conveyed, and where the notion, if not that of reciprocal action, is akin to it; viz. *reproach*, *compromise*, *approach*, &c. Now in certain languages (the Latin and Greek) some of these verbs have a passive form; i. e. they are deponents,—*loquor*, *colloquor*, *luctor*, *reluctor*, *amplector*, *suavior*, *osculor*, *suspikor*, Latin: φιλοτιμέομαι, φιλοφρονέομαι, μάχομαι, διαλέγομαι, ἀλέομαι, διαλύομαι, ἀμείβομαι, &c., Greek. Hence arises the hypothesis, that it is to their reciprocal power on the one hand, and to the connexion between the passive, reflective and reciprocal forms on the other, that these verbs owe their deponent character. The fact essential to the probability of this hypothesis is the connexion between the reflective forms and the reciprocal ones.

Now for one branch of languages this can be shown most satisfactorily. In Icelandic the middle voice is formed from the active by the addition of the reflective pronoun, *mik*, me, *sik*, him or self. Hence it is known by the terminations *mc* and *sc*, and by certain modifications of these affixes, viz. *st*, *s*, *z*, *mz*, *ms*. In the oldest stage of the language the reflective power of the middle voice, to the exclusion of a passive sense, is most constant: e. g. *hann var nafnadr* = he had the name given him; *hann nefnist* = he gave as his name, or named himself. It was only when the origin of the middle form became indistinct that its sense became either passive or deponent; as it generally is in the modern tongues of Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Now in the modern Scandinavian languages we have, on the one hand, certain deponent forms expressive of reciprocal action; whilst on the other we have, even in the very earliest stages of the Old Norse, middle or reflective forms used in a reciprocal sense. Of some of these, examples will be given: but the proof of their sense being reciprocal will not be equally conclusive in all. Some may perhaps be looked on as deponents (*ættust*, *beriastr*, *skiliastr*, *möðast*); whilst others may be explained away by the assumption of a passive construction (*fundoz* = they were found, not they found each other). Whatever may be the case with the words taken from the middle and modern stages of the language, this cannot be entertained in regard to the examples drawn from the oldest Norse composition, the Edda of Sæmund. For this reason the extracts from thence are marked *Edd. Sæm.*, and of these (and these alone) the writer has attempted to make the list exhaustive. The translations in Latin and Danish are those of the different editors.

1. *Ættust, fought each other.*

2. *Beriaz, strike each other.*

brödur muno beriaz.
fratres invicem pugnabunt.

Voluspa, 41. Edd. Sæm.

This word is used in almost every page of the Sagas as a deponent signifying *to fight*: also in the Feroic dialect.

3. *Bregþaz, interchange.*

orþom at bregþaz.
verba commutare.

Helga-Qvipa Hundingsbana, i. 41. ii. 26. Edd. Sæm.

4. *Drepiz, kill one another.*

finnuz þeir báðir daudir——en ecki vapn höfðu þeir nema bitlana af hestinum, ok þat hygja menn at þeir (Alrek and Eirek) hafi *drepiz* þar med. Sva segir Þjodolfr.—*Drepaz* kváðu.—Heimskringla. Ynglinga-Saga, p. 23.

The brothers were found dead—and no weapons had they except the bits of their horses, and men think they (Alrek and Eirek) had *killed each other* therewith. So says Thiodolf.—They said that they *killed each other*.

5. *Um-fapmaz, embrace each other.* See Atla-Qvipa hin Grænslenzko, 42.—*Edd. Sæm.*

6. *Földes, fell in with each other.*—Om morgonet efter *földes* wy in Kobenhaffn.—Norwegian Letters in 1531, A.D. See Samlingar til det Norske Folks Sprog og Historie, I. 2. 70. The morning after we *fell in with each other* in Copenhagen.

7. *Funduz, found each other, met.* See Vafprudnis-mal 17.—Sigurd-Qvip. i. 6. Edd. Sæm.—Fareyingar-Saga, p. 44. *Deir funduz* is rendered *de fandt hverandre*=*they found each other*, in Haldorsen's Lexic. Island.

ef iþ Gymer *finniz*.
if you and Gymer meet.

Harbards-l. 24. Edd. Sæm.

8. *Gættuz, consult each other.* See Voluspa, 6. 9. 21. 23. *Edd. Sæm.*

9. *Glediaz, rejoice each other.*

vapnom ok vádom
skulo vinir *glediaz*,
þæt er á sialfom sæmst:
vidr-géfendr ok endi gefendr
erost lengst vinir
ef þat biþr at verþa vel.

Rigsmal. 41.

armis ac vestibus
amici *mutuo se delectent*,
queis in ipso (datore) forent conspicua:
pretium renumerantes et remunerantes
inter se diutissime sunt amici
si negotium feliciter se dat.

The middle form and reciprocal sense of *erost* is remarkable in this passage.

10. Hauggvaz, *hack each other, fight.*

allir Einheriar
Opins túnom i
hauggvaz hverian dag.

all the Einheriar
in Odin's towns

hack each other every day.

Vafþrudnis-Mal. 41. Edd. Sæm.

ef þeir högvaz orþom á.

si se maledictis invicem insectentur. Sig-Qvið. ii. 1. Edd. Sæm.

11. Hættaz, *cease.*

hættomc hættingi.

cessemus utrinque a minaciis. Harbardsljóð, 51. Edd. Sæm.

Such is the translation of the editors, although the reciprocal power is not unequivocal.

12. Hittaz, *hit upon each other, meet.* Hittoz, Voluspa, 7. Hittomk, Hadding-skata, 22. Hittaz, Solar-l. 82. Edd. Sæm. Hittust, Ol. Trygv. Sag. p. 90. Hittuz oc beriaz, Heimskringla, Saga Halfd. Svart. p. 4. Hittuz, Yngl. Sag. p. 42. *alibi passim þeir hittu* is rendered, in Bjorn Haldorsen's Icelandic Lexicon, *de traf hinanden, they hit upon each other.*

13. Kiempis, *fight each other.*

gaar udi gaarden oc *kiempis*, oc nelegger hver hinanden, goes out in the house and *fight each the other*, and each knocks down the other. Such is the translation by Resenius, in modern Danish, of the following extract from Snorro's *Edda*, p. 34.—Ganga ut i gardinn og *beriastr*, og fellar huor annar. Here the construction is not, *they fell* (or knock down) *each the other*, but *each fells the other*; since *fellar* and *nelegger* are singular forms.

14. Mælast, *talk to each other, converse.* Talast, *ditto.*

Mælix þu. Vafþrudnismal, 9.

mælomc i sessi saman = colloquamur sedentes. ib. 19. Edd. Sæm.

mælast þeir *vid*, ádr þeir *skiliastr*, at þeir mundi þar *finnast* þa.—Fóst-brædra-Saga, p. 7.

they said to each other before they parted from each other that they should meet each other there.

Yngvi ok Bera satu ok *töluduz vidr*.—Heimskr. Yngl. S. p. 24.

Griss *mælti*; hverir ero þessir menn er sva *talast vid* bliðliga? Avaldi svarar; þa er Hallfrejdr Ottarson ok Kolfinna dóthir min. Ol. Trygv. Saga, p. 152. Griss said, who are these persons who *talk together* so blithely? Avaldi answers, they are H. O. and Kolfinna my daughter. *Talast* is similarly used in Feroic. *Kvödust*, bespoke each other, occurs in the same sense—þat var einn dag at Brand ok Finbogi *fundust* ok *kvödust* bliðliga.—Vatnsdæla-Sag. p. 16.

15. Mettæst, *meet each other, meet.*

Kungen aff Ffranchriche, kungen aff England, oc kungen aff Schottland

skule *motes* til Chalis.—Letter from Bergen in 1531, from Samlinger til det Norske Folks Sprog og Historie, i. 2. p. 53. The king of France, king of England, and king of Scotland should *meet each other* at Calais.

Throughout the Danish, Swedish and Feroic, this verb is used as a deponent.

16. *Rekaz, vex each other.*

gumnar margir
erosc gagn-hollir,
 enn at virpi *rekaz*. Rigsmal. 32. Edd. Sæm.

multi homines
sunt inter se admodum benevoli,
 sed tamen *mutuo se* (vel) in convivio *exagitant*.

17. *Sakaz, accuse each other, recriminate.*

at vit mynim siafrum *sakaz*,
 ut nos ipsi *mutuo* insectemur. Hamdis-Mal. 28.

ef við einir scolom
sáryrþom sakaz.
 si nobis duobus usu veniat
 amarulentis dicteriis invicem
 nos lacesere. Ægis-drecka, 5.

sculoþ inni her
sáryrþom sakaz. Ibid. 19. Edd. Sæm.

18. *Saz, looked at each other.*

saz i augv
 fadir ok módir. Rigsmal. 24.
 they looked at each other in the eyes,
 father and mother.

19. *Sættaz, settle between each other, reconcile.*—Atla-Mal. 45. Edd. Sæm.

Komu vinir þveggja því við, at þeir *sættuz*, ok lögdu konungar stefnu með sér, ok *hittuz* ok gérdo frid mellum sin.—Heimsk. Yngling-S. 42.

There came friends of both in order that they should be *reconciled*, and the kings sent messages between them, and *met* and made peace between them.—Also Vatnsd. S. p. 16.

20. *Seljas, to give to each other.*

seldez eiþa. Sig. Qv. iii. 1. Edd. Sæm.
 juramenta dederunt inter se.

21. *Sendaz, send, or let pass between each other.*

sato samty'nis,
senduz fár hugi,
henduz heipt-yrþi
 hvartki sér undi. Atla-Mal. 85.

They sat in the same town (dwelling),
 They *sent* between each other danger-thoughts,
 They *fetch*ed between each other hate-words,
 Not either way did they love each other.

Here, over and above the use of *senduz* and *henduz*, *ser* is equivalent to *hinanden*.

22. *Skiliaz, part from each other.*

Skiliumz.

Solar-Lioð. 82.

Skiliaz.

Sigurd-Qvip. i. 24.

Skiliomc.

Ibid. 53. Edd. Sæm.

Vit sjiljiast, *we two part*—

Occurs in the poem *Brinilda* (st. 109) in the Feroic dialect. In Danish and Swedish the word is deponent.

23. *Skiptust, interchange.*

Ðeir *skiptust* mörgum giöfum *vid* um vetrinn.—Vatns-dæla-S. 10.

they *made interchanges with each other* with many gifts for the winter.

Also in the Feroic.

24. *Strujast, strike one another, fight.* Feroic.

og *mötast* tair, og *strujast* avlaji langji.—Fareying-Sag. 18. Feroic text.

ok *mætast* þeir, ok *berjast* mjök leingi.—Icelandish text.

de *mödtes* og strede meget længe imod hinanden.—Danish text.

they *met* and *fought* long against *each other*.

at e vilde *vid gjordust* stálbröir, og *strujast* ikkji longur.—Feroic text, p. 21.

at við *gerðimst* fêlagar, en *berjumst* eigi leingr.—Icelandic text.

at vi skulle blive Stalbröde og ikke *slaaes* længer.—Danish text.

that we should become comrades and not *fight* longer.

The active form occurs in the same dialect :

tajr struija nú langji.

18.

25. *Truasc, trust each other.*

vel mættern þeir *truazc.*

För Skirnis. Edd. Sæm.

26. *Unnaz. See Veittaz.*

27. *Vegiz, attack each other.*

vilcat ec at iþ reipir *vegiz.*

Ægisdrecka 18. Edd. Sæm.

I will not that ye two angry *attack each other*.

28. *Veittaz, contract mutually.*

þav Helgi ok Svava *veittuz* varar, ok *unnoz* forþo mikit = Helgius et Svava pactum sponsalitium *inter se contraxerunt*, et alter alterum mirifice *amarunt*.—Haddingia-Sk. between 29 and 30).

29. *Verpaz, throw between each other.*

urpuz á orþom.

Atl.-M. 39. Edd. Sæm.

verba inter se jaciebant:

Such is a portion of the examples that prove the reciprocal power

of the reflective or middle verb in the language of Scandinavia; and that, during all its stages and in each of its derived dialects. It cannot be doubted that to this circumstance certain verbs in Danish and Swedish owe their deponent form: viz. *vi slåss*, we fight (strike one another); *vi brottas*, we wrestle; *vi omgås*, we have intercourse with; *vi mötas*, we meet, Swedish; *vi slaaes*, we fight; *vi skilles*, we part; *vi mödes*, we meet, Danish. In the latest Swedish grammar, by C. L. Daae, this reciprocal (*vekselvirkende*) power is recognized and exhibited. See *Udsigt over det Svenske Sprogs Grammatik*. Christiania, 1837. The same is the Molbech's *Danske Ordbog* in vv. *skilles*, *slaaes*, *mödes*.

Next to the Norse languages the French affords the best instances of the reciprocal power of the reflective verb; as *se battre*, *s'aimer*, *s'entendre*, *se quereller*, *se reconcilier*, *se disputer*, and other words of less frequent occurrence.

Ces enfans *s'aimaient*, *s'adoraient*, se sont jetés à mes pieds en pleurant.—*Les Inséparables*, A. 1. S. 1.

Les Républiques Italiens acharnées à *se détruire*.—*Pardessus* II. 65.

This has been recognized by an old grammarian, Restaut, who insists upon the use of the adverb *entre*, in order to avoid the ambiguity of such phrases as “vous vous dites des injures;” “nous nous écrivons souvent;” “Pierre et Antoine se louent à tout moment.”

By a writer in the *Museum Criticum* the reciprocal power of the Greek middle has been indicated. For the classical languages the question has not met with the proper investigation. Passages where the sense is at least as reciprocal as in the line

Χεῖρας τ' ἀλλήλων λαβέτην καὶ πιστώσαντο,—*Il.* vi. 233,

must be numerous.

In the Dutch language the use of *zich* for *elkander* is a peculiarity of the Guelderland and Overijssel dialects; as “zij hebt *zich* eslagen,” for “zij hebben *elkander* geslagen.” See “Opmerkingen omtrent den Gelderschen Tongval,” in *Taalkundig Magazijn* ii. 14. p. 403.

Of the use of *ser* for *hinanden* or *hverandre*, when uncombined with the verb, we have, amongst others, the following example in the Icelandic version of the *Paradise Lost*:—

Ef frá tilsyndar-
punkti hleyptu *ser*
planetur fram,
ok *mættust* miklum gny
ó midjum himni.

B. 6.

Similar to this are the phrases *vi see os igjen*, we see us (each other) again, in Danish, and *wir sehen uns wider*, in German. Examples from the M. H. G. are given in the D. G. iv. The Turkish sign of the reciprocal verb is identical with the demonstrative pronoun, *i. e.* *ش*. This may possibly indicate a connection between the two forms.

Other points upon the subject in hand may be collected from the

Deutsche Grammatik, iii. 13. 82; iv. 454. Here the adverbial character of the M. H. G. *einander* for *einandern*, the omission of *ein*, as in *anander* for *an einander*, and the omission (real or supposed) of *ander* in "*wider ein=wider einander*," are measures of the laxity of language caused by the peculiarity of the combination in question. At present it is sufficient to repeat the statement, that for one group of languages at least there is satisfactory proof of certain deponents having originally been reciprocal, and of certain reciprocal expressions having originally been reflective.

After the reading of the paper it was remarked that the Hithpael verbs in Hebrew had occasionally a reciprocal form. The following instances, in Greek, of the use of the reflective pronoun for the reciprocal, were also communicated by Professor Malden:—

Soph. Antig. 145. ὦ, πατρὸς ἐνὸς
μητρός τε μιᾶς φύντε, καθ' αὐτοῖν
δικριτεῖς λόγχας στήσαντ', ἔχετον
κοινού θανάτου μέρος ἄμφω.

In Herod. iv. 11. ἀποθανόντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων is explained by ἀλλήλων; and the same idiom was used in iii. 49, though the text is now corrupted by the introduction of the gloss, εἰσὶ ἀλλήλοισι διάφοροι ἐόντες ἐκείνοις.

Plato Lysis, p. 215, b. c. Πῶς οὖν οἱ ἀγαθοὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἡμῖν φίλοι ἔσονται τὴν ἀρχὴν, οἳ μήτε ἀπόντες ποθεινοὶ ἀλλήλοις (ἱκανοὶ γὰρ ἑαυτοῖς καὶ χωρὶς ὄντες), μήτε παρόντες χρεῖαν αὐτῶν ἔχουσι; τοὺς δὲ τοιούτους τίς μηχανὴ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιεῖσθαι ἀλλήλους; Οὐδεμία, ἔφη. Φίλοι δέ γε οὐκ ἂν εἶεν, μὴ περὶ πολλοῦ ποιούμενοι ἑαυτούς. Here it is to be noticed, that in each instance ἀλλήλους has gone immediately before.

In the Parmenides, after speaking of absolute substances (οὐσία αὐτὴ καθ' αὐτήν), he goes on to speak of relative notions, such as subjection and dominion (δουλεία and δεσποτεία), p. 133. d. Οὐκοῦν καὶ ὅσαι τῶν ἰδεῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλας εἰσὶν αἷ εἰσιν, αὐτὰ πρὸς αὐτὰς τὴν οὐσίαν ἔχουσιν, &c. τὰ δὲ παρ' ἡμῖν ταῦτα, ὁμώνυμα ὄντα ἐκείνοις, αὐτὰ αὖ πρὸς αὐτὰ ἐστίν. And so at the end of the same page.

In Æsch. Sept. c. Theb. 732, words compounded with αὐτὸς are used reciprocally,

ἐπεὶ δ' ἂν αὐτοκτόνως
αὐτοδάϊκτοι θάνωσι,

said of the two brothers.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

APRIL 26, 1844.

No. 21.

HENSLEIGH WEDGWOOD, Esq., in the Chair.

Professor Molbech, of Copenhagen, was elected an Honorary Member of the Society.

The following gentlemen were then elected Members of the Society :—

Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Principal of King's College, London.

F. H. Trithen, Esq., of the British Museum.

Alex. I. D'Orsey, Esq., High School, Glasgow.

William Hayes, Esq., Assistant-Master, King's College, London.

The Rev. Rowland Williams, Fellow and Tutor of King's College, Cambridge.

A paper was then read :—

“On the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands :”—
Continued. By the Rev. Richard Garnett.

In concluding, for the present, the Celtic portion of our subject, a few miscellaneous observations will be offered on such points as appear most interesting to the general philologist. As a preliminary to this, it may be advisable to make a few further remarks on the *genuineness* of the Celtic terms, placed in comparison with those of other European languages, and the means by which that genuineness may be tested. There are cases in which it is difficult to arrive at any absolute certainty :—for example, the resemblance of the Welsh *celu* (to conceal) with the Latin *celo* would create a suspicion that the former was borrowed from the latter ; while on the other hand, the way in which it branches out into derivatives and compounds is strongly in favour of its originality. The safest principle in this investigation is, to regard that language as having the best claim to originality which furnishes the most satisfactory explanation of the original roots, or component elements of words. Most persons, for example, would be apt to suppose that the familiar term *funnel* was undoubtedly a vernacular English word, and to repudiate all idea of a Celtic origin for it. Nevertheless it will be found, on examination, to have neither etymology nor intrinsic meaning in Teutonic ; while the Welsh *ffynel* (air-hole) is demonstrably derived from *ffwn*, breath, referred with great probability by Pictet to Sanscrit *pavana*, and exactly equivalent to Latin *spiraculum*. *Cobble*, a boat ; admits of no satisfactory explanation from Anglo-Saxon or German sources ; but the Welsh *ceubal* may be resolved into *hollow shaft* or *trunk* : thus showing both the antiquity and genuineness of the term. The word *bride* occurs indeed in all the Germanic dialects, Gothic in-

cluded, but it is in all a perfectly isolated term, without intrinsic meaning. Some German philologists have indeed referred it to Sanscrit *prī*, amare; an etymology which violates the established laws of permutation of letters. In all known Teutonic cognates of this root, we regularly find *f* instead of *p*: *frion*, to love; *freyen*, to woo; *freund*, friend, &c. &c. It would have been more to the purpose to compare Greek *πράμει*, to obtain by purchase; which is strictly cognate with Welsh *priawd* (proprius), possessed, owned, a spouse; the stem of *priodi*, to marry; *priodas*, marriage; and many words of allied import. The allusion is to the custom, almost universal among semi-civilized nations, of purchasing a bride from her parents. The Germanic term has every appearance of having been borrowed; the Celtic words are undoubtedly original. Another remarkable instance occurs in the word *travail*, labour, sorrow, &c.; French *travail*; the origin of which is nowhere to be found, except in Welsh *trafael*, a compound of the prefix *tra*, exceeding, and *mael*, work, labour; consequently not borrowed from the French or English. The word undoubtedly came to us through the medium of the Norman French: but we have another form of it deduced more directly from the original; viz. *turmoil*, stir, bustle; and moreover the simple form *moil*, to labour; a word common in our older writers.

Another important criterion for determining the genuineness of words, is the observation of the *forms* peculiar to the various languages and dialects. It is well known, for example, that the *spiritus asper* in Greek does not in general correspond with *h* in Latin, but is a representative of a more ancient sibilant or digamma; and the same aspirate in the Germanic tongues is a modification of a more primitive guttural, *k* or *g*. It has already been observed by Lhuyd and others, that where the Greek and Latin differ, the Welsh generally corresponds with the former and the Gaelic with the latter; and that the Teutonic tongues bear a greater analogy to the Gaelic than the Cymric, especially in the sibilants, as may be instanced in Greek *ἅλς*; Welsh *halen* (salt); Latin *sal*; Gaelic *salann*; German *salz*. When therefore we find words current in the Teutonic dialects in which this analogy is not observed, we may suspect them not to be original. The term *hawk* (Old German *happuc*) is found in one form or other in all the dialects; but instead of following, as it regularly ought to do, the analogy of Gaelic *seabhog*, it agrees with Welsh *hebbog*, and was therefore probably borrowed from a Cymric dialect. The Welsh *hafyn*, a haven or harbour, seems to be significant in the sense of a *still, calm place*; and if it be original, the German *hafen* is evidently not. In like manner the Gaelic *seiceal* (flax-comb) shows the Welsh *heislan*, *heisyllt*, to be genuine words, and our *hackle* or *hatchel* most probably adopted ones. *Hem* and *seam* are radically the same word; but the latter is the only legitimate Germanic form. Pursuing the same analogy with respect to the gutturals, we may feel pretty confident that our *corner* is not of Teutonic origin, but from the Welsh or Bret. *cornel*; the true Anglo-Saxon form being *hyrn*. *Cyrm*, cry or clamour; *cyrman*, to cry, though

of ancient standing in Anglo-Saxon, are suspicious from their agreement with the Celtic *garm*, and are probably not so genuine as the other form *hryman*.

Words adopted by the Celtic tribes from the Latin occasionally furnish interesting data respecting the ancient pronunciation of particular letters : for example, *ysgeler*, wickedness, Latin *scelus*, must have been adopted by the colonial Britons from the Romans, as it was never current among the Anglo-Saxons or Normans ; and serves as an evidence at the present day that *c* before *e* had the hard sound, not the soft palatal or sibilant one now given to it by most modern Europeans. From the description given by Quintilian and others of the harsh sound of the Latin *f*, it is conjectured to have partaken in some degree of the nature of a sibilant. This idea receives some countenance from a singular phænomenon in Irish ; namely, that certain words obviously borrowed from the Latin do not commence with *f*, but with *s*. A few instances are, Irish *sorn*, oven, Welsh *ffwrn*, Latin *furnus* ; Irish *suist*, a flail, Welsh *ffust*, Latin *fustis* ; Irish *srian*, a bridle, Latin *frænum* ; Irish *seinister*, a window, Latin *fenestra*. It is difficult to assign any cause for this discrepancy, except we suppose a marked distinction between the pronunciation of the Latin element and the ordinary *f*, which is a very common constituent of Irish words.

The insertion or omission of a nasal element, something analogous to the Sanscrit *anuswara*, is very common in the Celtic dialects. The general tendency of the Gaelic, as compared with Welsh, is to drop the nasal sound : for example, Welsh *cainc*, branch, Gaelic *geug* ; Welsh *dant*, tooth, Gaelic *deud* ; Welsh *cant*, hundred, Gaelic *cead* ; with many others. The employment of this element in the Cymric dialects sometimes appears a little capricious : for instance we have *lleipr*, flaccid, English limber ; *lleiprog*, muræna, English lamprey ; *tampyr*, a wax-light, English taper ; and *llimp*, smooth, soft, agreeing closely with English limp. An attention to this phænomenon will frequently enable us to detect analogies which otherwise would not be very obvious : for instance, the Anglo-Saxon *sið*, semita, does not bear a very close resemblance to Welsh *hynt*, way, path, journey. But when we learn, by comparing the other Teutonic dialects, that the original form is *sind*, and remember that the Cymric *h* regularly answers to the Teutonic *s*, we have less difficulty in admitting an original affinity between the two. It is even possible that *semita* may be the same word, with the insertion of a vowel. The Gaelic *saod*, track, journey, agrees with the Anglo-Saxon in the omission of the nasal.

Pott, treating of the remarkable propensity of the Pali and Pracrit dialects to reject a liquid following a mute, observes that a similar phænomenon sometimes presents itself in other languages, instancing the Low German *bost*, English *boast*, as probably identical with High German *sich brüsten*. The Welsh *ffrost*, bragging, boasting, appears to give some countenance to this idea. Other instances of the same phænomenon occur in Anglo-Saxon *spæcan*, English *speak*, compared with German *sprechen* ; and Anglo-Saxon *specca*, English *speck*,

speckle, compared with the Yorkshire *spreckle* and the South German *spreckeln*. The Welsh forms *brych*, variegated, *ysbrychu*, to speckle, show that the *r* is original. By the same analogy, *to pat* may very well be from the Welsh *pratiaw*, to stroke or fondle; and *to fume*, from Welsh *ffromi*, to chafe, be indignant. Many similar instances might be given from a great variety of languages.

A number of interesting examples might be produced of the manner in which labials and gutturals are interchanged in the Celtic dialects, and in words which other languages appear to have adopted from them. Thus we have in Welsh *cecru* and *bicru*, to wrangle, English *bicker*; Gaelic *seasg*, dry, Bret. *hesk*, Welsh *hysp*; Welsh *llas*, *ys-lac*, slack, German *schlaff*; Gaelic *sgolt*, to split or cleave, German *spalten*; with a multitude of others. The keeping this peculiarity in mind will render many etymologies very obvious which have hitherto been little known. Sometimes a dental appears as the substitute of the labial or guttural: as Gaelic *cas*, cough, Latin *tussis*; Gaelic *ceathair*, four, Greek *τέσσαρες*. This permutation is however comparatively infrequent.

It has been frequently observed by philologists, that new words appear to have been formed in various languages by prefixing a consonant to the simple root. Many curious illustrations of this process may be derived from the Celtic dialects. If, for example, we take a number of simple words commencing with *l*, we shall find that the corresponding terms in other languages, and even in the same language, frequently prefix a guttural, palatal, or sibilant element. Thus Welsh *llab*, stroke or blow, appears in the augmented forms *clap*, *flap*, *slap*; Welsh *llac*, laxus, *slack*; Welsh *llag*, segnis, remissus, *lag*, *laggard*, *flag*, *slug*, *sluggard*; Welsh *llavar*, loquela, Danish *klavre*, to prate, Sc. *claver*, Sp. *palabra*, word, speech; Welsh *llawr*, area, also in the enlarged form *clawr*, Gaelic *clàr*, *blàr*, a flat surface, plain, English *floor*. A comparison of the different Welsh and English forms will show that the words *rib*, *ridge*, *brim*, *brink*, *crimp*, *stripe*, all include the same radical, modified according to the processes already pointed out; viz. by the interchange of labials and gutturals; the insertion of a nasal, or the prefixing of one or more consonants.

One of these preformatives, if they are to be regarded as such, is deserving of more especial notice. Grimm, in his 'Deutsche Grammatik,' observes that the initial *s* frequently appears to have originally been a distinct component element, probably a particle; and that the root of the Anglo-Saxon *smael*, English *small*, for example, appears to exist in the Slavonic *mal*, little. This sagacious conjecture is excellently confirmed by the co-existence of the simple and the augmented forms in Welsh; *mal*, light, fickle, *ys-mal*, light, small; *ys* being a common prefix, apparently answering to the Latin *ex* in its intensive signification. A knowledge of this phenomenon enables us to establish a connexion between a multitude of words in all the Indo-European languages, especially between the Celtic and Teutonic branches. The following list, which is capable of being greatly enlarged, may serve as a specimen:—

Welsh.

pawd, <i>shank</i>	ys-bawd(<i>blade-bone</i>); spawd, Prov.
brig, <i>shoot</i>	ys-brig; sprig.
brych, <i>variegated</i>	ys-brych; spreckled, Yorksh.
garm, <i>cry</i>	ys-garmes, <i>conflict</i> ; skirmish.
cawd, <i>covering</i>	ys-gawd, <i>shadow</i> ; schatten, Germ.
cin, <i>skin</i>	ys-gin, <i>fur-robe</i> ; skin.
gogi, <i>shake, jog</i>	ys-gogi; shog, Sc.
crafu, <i>scratch</i>	ys-grafu; scrape.
cre, <i>cry</i>	ys-gre; schrey, Germ.
crech, <i>cry</i>	ys-grech; shriek, screech.
cub, <i>bundle</i>	{ ys-gub, <i>sheaf, broom</i> ; sceaf, A.-S.; scopa, Lat.
— —	ys-gubor, <i>barn</i> ; scheure, Germ.
cud, <i>motion</i>	{ ys-gudaw, <i>move hastily</i> ; scud, scuttle.
cwta, <i>short</i>	ys-gwt, <i>short tail</i> ; scut.
llac, <i>lax</i>	ys-lac; slack.
llaif, <i>cutting-off</i>	ys-leifiaw, <i>slice</i> ; sliver, Prov.
llwch, <i>stagnum</i>	ys-lwch, <i>quagmire</i> ; slough.
mal, <i>light</i>	ys-mal; small.
mwg, <i>smoke</i>	ys-mwcach, <i>puff of smoke</i> ; smoke.
noden, <i>thread</i>	ys-noden, <i>fillet</i> ; snood, Sc.
par, <i>spear</i>	ys-par; spear.
paith, <i>prospect</i>	ys-peithiaw, <i>explore</i> ; spy.
pig, <i>point</i>	ys-pig; spike.
— —	ys-pigawd; spigot.
pin, <i>sharp point, pin</i>	ys-pin, <i>thorn</i> ; spina, Lat.
pinc, <i>chaffinch</i>	{ ys-bincyn; spink, bull-spink, Yorksh.
plyg, <i>fold</i>	ys-plyg; splice.
twc, <i>cut</i>	ys-twc, <i>shock of corn</i> ; stook, Prov.
gwain, <i>service</i>	ys-wain, <i>esquire</i> ; swain.

It will be seen from the following instances that the Gaelic frequently agrees with the Teutonic and other dialects in prefixing the sibilant, when the corresponding words in Welsh want it.

Welsh.

llai, <i>mud</i>	G. laib, slaib; slab, slabby.
llifu, <i>grind, polish</i>	slicb; schleifen, Germ.
llimp, <i>soft</i>	sliom, <i>smooth, slender</i> ; slim.
llyngcu, <i>swallow</i>	sluig; schlucken, Germ.
mèr, <i>marrow</i>	smior; smior, Isl., <i>butter</i> , &c.
naddu, <i>to cut</i>	snaidh; schneiden, Germ.
nofio, <i>to swim</i>	snamh; snā, Sanscr.
nyf, <i>snow</i>	sneachd; snieg, Slav.
bar, <i>rail, shaft</i>	sparr, <i>beam</i> ; spar.
colpo, Ital., <i>blow</i>	sgeilp, <i>stroke</i> ; skelp, Yorksh.
calidus, Lat.	sgald; scald.
kel, Bret. <i>narration</i>	sgeul; spell? A.-S.

Sometimes the Teutonic dialects, as well as the Latin, omit the initial *s* of the analogous Gaelic words :—

Gaelic.	
slad, <i>steal</i>	W. lladratta ; latro, Lat.
slat, <i>rod</i>	llath ; lath.
snàthad, <i>needle</i>	nydell ; nadel, Germ.
sniomh, <i>spin</i>	nyddu ; nere, Lat.
snedd, <i>larva pediculi</i>	nedd ; nit.
spadal, { <i>plough-staff</i>	pattle, Sc.
{ <i>short oar</i>	paddle.
spairt, <i>plaster</i>	parge.
stang, <i>pool</i>	tank.
streup, <i>altercation</i>	threap, Prov.

Generally speaking, however, the Teutonic, especially the Belgic and Low German dialects, agree with the Gaelic more frequently than with the Welsh.

The following Anglo-Saxon words with the sibilant initial may be referred, with more or less probability, to the annexed simple forms in Celtic :—

Anglo-Saxon.	Welsh.
scearfan, <i>to cut in pieces</i>	cerfio, <i>to cut</i> .
scen, <i>bright, clean, sheen</i>	cain, <i>bright</i> .
scop, <i>stem, trunk</i>	cyff.
scriðan, <i>to wander</i>	crwydraw.
scrob, <i>shrub</i>	craobh ; Gael. <i>tree</i> .
scycels, <i>mantle</i>	kougoul ; Bret. <i>cloak</i> .
slican, <i>to strike</i>	llaciaw, <i>to beat</i> .
slið, <i>smooth, mild</i>	llaidd.
sliw, <i>dyed, coloured</i>	lliw, <i>colour</i> .
slog, <i>slough</i>	llwch.
smaeðe, <i>smooth</i>	mwyth, esmwyth ; Gael. <i>maoth</i> .
sparran, <i>to shut, fasten</i>	bar.
spearca, <i>spark</i>	gwraich.
straede, <i>step</i>	troed, <i>foot</i> .
straegan, <i>strew</i>	traff, ys-traff, <i>spreading</i> .
strec, <i>brave, stout</i>	trech.
swaec, <i>savour</i>	chweg, <i>sweet</i> .
swaeð, <i>footstep</i>	gwadn, <i>sole</i> .
sweard, <i>sword, turf</i>	gweryd.
sweor, <i>neck</i>	gwar.

The following miscellaneous words are of similar character :—

Welsh.	
glafoerio	slaver.
grill, <i>sharp, creaking</i>	shrill.
gwegiaw, <i>to totter</i>	swag.
gwichiaw, <i>cry sharply</i>	squeak.
pwcca, <i>hobgoblin</i>	spucken, Germ., <i>to be haunted</i> .
tarpore, Ital. <i>to prune</i>	sterp, Bret., <i>pruning-hook</i> .

ramper, Fr. <i>to creep</i>	skrampa, Bret.
grin, Eng.	skriña, Bret.
troule, O. F. <i>trollop</i>	stroulen, Bret.

Much light would be thrown on the science of comparative etymology, if we could positively ascertain in every case whether the simpler or the fuller form ought to be regarded as the original. For example, have the Sanscrit *snā*, to bathe, Gaelic *snamh*, to swim, gained a prefix; or have the Latin *na-re*, Welsh *nofio*, lost a primitive initial? This inquiry is beset with numerous difficulties, and many specious arguments might be alleged on both sides of the question. The Welsh prefix *ys* may be plausibly accounted for as a *significant* element, modifying in many instances the import of more simple roots, which therefore may be reasonably presumed to have had a distinct previous existence. The comparison of a number of languages is also generally in favour of the simple form. The ostensible root *mal*, denoting comminution, diminution, *v.t.q.*, occurs in a multitude of tongues, Semitic included; while *ys-mal* and *small* are exceptional forms, and very probably compounds. On the other hand, it must be remembered that certain combinations of letters admissible in one language are not tolerated in others. No Welsh word can commence with *s* followed by a consonant; nor can a liquid or a medial mute follow an initial *s* in Latin. If therefore original words, differently constituted, existed at all, they must necessarily undergo some modification to adapt them to Roman or Cymric organs. Supposing the Latins to adopt the Sanscrit root *smṛi*, to remember, it is very likely that they would drop the sibilant, especially in a reduplicate form like *memor*. It is true that the objectionable sound might be and actually was got rid of in a variety of ways: by inserting or prefixing a vowel; by vocalizing the second consonant, especially if a labial; by substituting a tenuis for a medial; or by dropping the second consonant instead of the first. Thus we find the German *schwester*, which comparatively few nations in the world could utter with facility, under the various modifications of *sister*, *soror*, *sior*, *piuthar*, *chwaer*, *hor*, and *kho*; and our own *star*, as ἀστὴρ, *ser*, and *sitarah*; while the Sanscrit *tāra* may possibly have lost its initial. It has been remarked on a former occasion that the Welsh often overcomes the difficult articulation by prefixing a vowel, *e. g.* *ysgeler*, from Latin *scelus*; but there are some remarkable instances of an elision of the second consonant which do not appear to be generally known.

stan, O. Germ., Lat. <i>stare</i>	Welsh. safu.
staff	saffwn, <i>beam, shaft</i> .
staunen, Germ., <i>to wonder</i>	sànu.
sterno, Lat., <i>to spread</i>	sarnu.
στέρω, <i>to love</i>	serch.
stoppel, Germ., <i>stubble</i>	sofi.
stimulus, <i>a goad</i>	swmwl.
stun	sy'nu, <i>to be stunned or amazed</i> .
stürzen, Germ., <i>to fall</i>	syrthiaw.
stið, A. S., <i>stiff</i>	syth.

A little examination would probably bring to light many others, and help to establish analogies scarcely suspected. For instance, Gaelic *sil*, to drop, distil, Welsh *hidlu*, may possibly be cognate with Latin *stillo*. Thus the Latin *limus*, mud, appears to be related to our *slime*, and *limus*, askance, to the Low German *slim*; and as a Latin word cannot commence with *sl*, it is very likely that the sibilant may have been rejected. Many similar phenomena might be pointed out, some of which may perhaps become the subject of a separate paper. At present we shall conclude this division of our subject with observing, that an accurate knowledge of the permutations of sounds in cognate languages is the very foundation of all rational etymology. Much has been undoubtedly accomplished in this department, but large fields still remain comparatively unexplored. It is believed that the light which might be thrown on this subject by a careful study of the peculiarities of the Celtic languages, renders them eminently worthy of the attention of philologists.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

MAY 10, 1844.

No. 22.

The Rev. DR. BOSWORTH in the Chair.

A Lecture on the Oriental Alphabets, by Professor Duncan Forbes, was laid on the table. Presented by the author.

A paper was then read :—

“On the Use of the Dative in English Syntax.” By Edwin Guest, Esq.

The syntax of the Gothic languages seems to have taken its present form at a period when the noun was generally considered to have four cases—the nominative, the genitive, the dative, and the accusative. In modern English the last two cases can no longer be distinguished from the nominative by any inflexion, but the scheme of our syntax would be both unsatisfactory and imperfect, if we refused to take notice of relations, in reference to which that syntax has been so often modified.

Bopp, who considers the Greek and Latin dative as identical with the Sanscrit locative, recognises in the dative singular of the Gothic languages the Sanscrit instrumental case. This case he “believes” to be formed by adding to the crude noun the Sanscrit particle *ā*. The particle *ā* is often used as a prefix, and signifies “limit, inceptive or conclusive,” *from, unto, or until*. Wils. Sanscrit Dict. It will probably turn out to be the same word as the Latin preposition *a*, the French *à*, and the Welsh and Irish *a*.

Though we admit the identity of the Gothic dative and the Sanscrit instrumental case, it does not necessarily follow that the power of the Gothic dative was in its origin instrumental. The Gothic dative is often used, like the Sanscrit instrumental case, to denote the instrument; but this application of the case may be merely a secondary use of the inflexion, and indeed if we adopt Bopp’s etymology, it seems difficult to arrive at any other conclusion. If its inflexion be the Sanscrit *ā*, the primitive meaning of our dative must have been “limit, inceptive or conclusive.” The general term is used, because, though we have analysed only one form of the dative, it is the well-known property of artificial grammar to bring the less frequently used forms into consistency and harmony with the more important ones.

We shall begin our notice of the English dative with what we have assumed to be its primitive meaning, and then endeavour to give its various secondary applications in their order. If Bopp’s hypothesis be the true one, we may thus approach a natural arrangement; if it be unsound (and it has been much questioned), we shall, as in ordinary grammars, have a merely artificial arrangement. It

will however possess some convenience, as its principle is obvious, and may at least afford us an aid to the memory.

In the following examples the dative signifies limit conclusive, *unto*.

1. Sir, he said, *tak mi* (deliver to me) *thi sone*. Seuyn Sages, 71.
2. Florent seyde "Syr, wylt thou so,
Tak me, and haue hem bothe two." Octavian, 710.
3. ——— into those thievish dens he went,
And thence did all the spoyles and treasures take—
—— of which *the best he did his love betake*. F. Q. 6. 11. 51.
4. When in your motion you are hot and dry,
And that he calls for drink, I'll *have preferr'd him*
A chalice for the nonce. Haml. 4. 6.

In the following cases the action is merely figurative:—

5. *His tuege sones he gef his lond*. R. Gl. 262.
6. Tho Nennyn hadde þat gode swerd, aboute he smot to gronde
Ech mon, þat he þerwith smot, he *gef dethe's wonde*. R. Br. 49.
7. ——— let the trumpets sound,
While we *return these dukes what we decree*. R. II. 1. 3.

Under this head may be ranged the use of the dative after such verbs as, *to say, to talk, to listen, &c.*

8. Tharfore of hir namore I tell,
Bot of the son *I sal yow say*. Seuyn Sages, 22.
9. He will *speak thee* fair and say, what wantest thou?
Ecclesiasticus 13. 6.
10. — I pray, *talk me* of Cassio. Othello, 4. 4.
11. *Listen me*, Lord Knoute, if it be þi wille. R. Br. 49.
12. *Listening their fear*, I could not say amen. Macbeth, 2. 2.
13. ——— I fairly step aside,
And *hearken*, if I may, *her business* here. Comus.

In the following examples the dative signifies limit inceptive, *from*.

14. ——— they dorsten lay hir necke,
The miller shuld not *stele hem half a pecke*
Of corn by sleight, ne by force hem reve.
Chau. Reves Tale, 90.
15. ——— that—overcome
The Brutones, þat hem hider brouzte and þat lond *hem benome*.
R. Glou. 3.
16. ——— I will not vex your souls,
Since presently your souls *must part your bodies*. R. II. 4. 1.

It seems to be a rule very generally established in the Gothic languages, that the dative should follow the verb and precede the accusative; unless the accusative be a pronoun personal, when it generally takes precedence. In the Old English we have the accusative occasionally placed before the verb, and the dative very often

in this position, Ex. 5. 6. The latter syntax is frequently met with in clauses that contain a relative.

17. Mi childeren þat ich ʒef *my god*, beþ myne meste fon.
R. Gl. 35.

18. long purples,
That liberal shepherds *give a grosser name*. Hamlet, 4. 7.

19. So will I grow, so live, so die, my Lord,
Ere I will yield my virgin patent up
Unto his lordship, *whose unwished yoke*
My soul consents not to *give sovereignty*. M. N. D. 1. 1.

In the Anglo-Saxon much greater freedom was allowed in the position of the words, and remains of this earlier syntax are occasionally to be met with in the Old-English.

20. nomon ne may bet *do*
Gyle another þan þilke þat he trusteth mest to. R. Gl. 63.

21. ——— he had *yeven drinke his gayler* so
That all the night though that men wold him shake,
The gailer slept, he mighte not awake.
Chau. Knightes Tale, 617.

It is not easy to say by what deflection of meaning the case now under consideration acquired its instrumental character. We might perhaps conjecture that the instrument was considered as the cause *from* which the effect proceeded; as the Latins, in order to express the efficient cause, sometimes used their preposition *a*. But there are considerations which may lead us to refer it to a different origin. The French *à* not unfrequently performs the office of the Sanscrit instrumental inflexion—*se battre à l'épée, travailler à l'aiguille, peindre à l'huile*, &c.; and the Welsh preposition *a* has occasionally the same power given to it. In these cases the instrument is considered as accompanying the agent—as something *with* which the act is done. If we thus explain the inflexion of the Sanscrit instrumental case, we must suppose the particle *ā* to have taken the several meanings, *unto, at, with*.

The use of the dative as an instrumental case is common in the Anglo-Saxon, though it is but rarely met with in the Old-English.

22. He gaf him armes, and made him knight *ys owne hand*.
R. Glou. 60.

23. *His owen hand* then made he ladders thre.
Chau. Milleres Tale, 438.

Perhaps under this head we may range the following singular constructions.

24. I will a round unvarnished tale deliver
Of my whole course of love, *what drugs, what charms,*
What conjurations, and what mighty magic,
For such proceedings I am charged withal,
I won his daughter. Othello, 1. 1.

25. let us once more *assail your ears*,
That are so fortified against our story,
What we two nights have seen. Hamlet, 1. 1.

One of the chief offices of the dative is to express *relation*—to denote the person or thing in respect of whom or which something is predicated. The particular kind of relation indicated is mere matter of convention; but it is nevertheless curious to observe how much conformity has been produced by the common wants of language, in many grammatical systems, which otherwise differ widely from each other. The English and Latin datives, according to Bopp's theory, have different origins, and yet strikingly resemble each other in their syntax. Admitting his hypothesis to be correct, the only explanation we can give of this resemblance is, the use of both the datives as *cases of relation*. The various purposes to which the case of relation (if we may use the term) is applicable, render it a common substitute for other cases; and in the Greek we find it discharging at once the duties of the dative, the instrumental and the locative. Hence we have much difficulty in arguing as to the origin of such a case from the use made of it in construction; and analogies of form* (loose and uncertain as is the aid they afford) may perhaps furnish us with the best means we have of tracing its history.

The dative is very often found in sentences where an adjective or substantive is attributed to the subject, not generally, but in respect of some particular individual.

26. Fortune was *them debonaire*. Gower, Conf. Am. Prol.
 27. A knave child that was *them dere*. Seunyn Sages, 15.
 28. God is *þe turned grim*
 Oup̃er in word or dede has þou greued him. R. Br. 94.
 29. That spear is *him enough* to don a thousand groan.
 F. Q. 2. 3. 12.
 30. It were *me lever* than twenty pound worth land.
 Chau. Frankeleines Prol.
 31. — death *me liefer* were than such despight. F. Q. 2. 1.

In Ex. 30, the pronoun indeterminate is the subject, and *lever* the predicate; but in such phrases as *me liefer was*, we may perhaps consider the adjective as the subject, for the Anglo-Saxon, like the Greek, often used the neuter adjective as a substantive:

32. *Me liefer were* with point of foeman's spear be dead.
 F. Q. 3. 2. 6.
 33. *Loth him was* that dede to do. Iay le Freine, 318.
 34. *Betere us is* to giue and saue us fro disceite. R. Br. 262.
 35. *beter him hadde ybe*
 Have bi leued þer doune, þan y lerned to fle. R. Glou 29.
 36. And *wel was him*, that ther to chosen was.
 Chau. Knightes Tale, 1261.

* The discovery of certain analogies of form between the Mæso-Gothic dative and the Sanscrit instrumental case seems to have been the chief motive which induced Bopp to pronounce these cases identical.

37. ——— *well were thy name and thee,*
Were thou inditched in great secresie. Hall. Sat. 3. 2.
38. Phædra answerde, "I wis *me is as wo*
For him, as ever I was for any man."
Chau. Legende of Ariadne.
39. Ah *woe is me* for Gloster, wretched man!——
Be *woe** for me— 2 H. VI. 3. 2.
40. *Shame him was* to fle, and so him com that day. R. Br. 204.
41. Merlyn *wat ys the,*
Pou faderles schrewe wy misdostow me. R. Glou. 128.
42. Hise maistres askede *what him was.* Seuyn Sages, 709.
43. Erlys and barouns come hym to,
And his quene dede alsoo,
And askyd hym *what hym was.* Rich. Cœur de Lion, 1123.

In Ex. 38, we must consider *wo* as the neuter adjective used substantively, "to me is as woful (case) for him as ever I was (woful) for any man." The ellipsis is of the kind called *zeugma*. *Wat ys the* in Ex. 41, is equivalent to the modern phrase, "what is the matter with thee?"

Other verbs than the verb-substantive are found in construction with this dative; for instance, the verbs *to come, to fall, to hap, to tide, to sit, to stand, &c.*

44. Noȝer bi north no bi south *com him* neuer help. R. Br. 41.
45. God wote said þe kyng now *comes me trauaille.* R. Br. 16.
46. Now and he get more, the deville me spede—
For *that cam hym* fulle light cheap.
Townley, Myst. Mact. Abel.
47. And þus *him fel wreche of God* for he þe apostle slow3.
R. Gl. 70.
48. And oft time sche said allas
That *him was fallen* so hard a cas. Am. and Amiloun, 1265.
49. *Harald* for his trespas yet *felle a vilainy.* R. Br. 53.
50. Now wol I tellen forth *what happed me.*
Chau. W. of Bathes Prol.
51. *What shuld us tiden* of this newe lawe
But thraldom of our bodies. Chau. M. of Lawes Tale.
52. Fair grace William fand, *his chance* fulle welle *him satte.*
R. Br. 72.
53. Thereof ne *stod him non owe.* Seuyn Sages, 1888.
54. *What remains him less*
Than unknown dangers, and as hard escape? P. L. 2. 443.

To have lief, to have loth, &c., were common idioms in the Old-English.

55. And *loth he hadde ys* newew to honge or spille. R. Glou. 53.

* *Woe* is an adjective as well as a substantive: *I am woe for it*, Temp. 1. 1.
He waxed woe and wan, St. and H. Ps. 30.

56. *I hadde lever dien on a knif*
 Than the offenden, &c. Chau. Merch. Tale, 907.

A dative of the pronoun was often subjoined to the adjective; and in such case the subject was very generally omitted.

57. *Him had he lever*, I dare wel undertake
 At thilke time, than all his wethers blake,
 That, &c. Chau. Milleres Tale, 355.
58. she a doughter hath y bore,
All had here lever han borne a knave child.
 Chau. Clerkes Tale, 248.
59. In prison was Roberd al hys lyf and ȝut ich understonde,
Him adde betere abbe i be kyng of the holy lond.
 Rob. Glou. 426.
60. *Betere hem hadde* be at Rome, þan y hosted þere.
 Rob. Glou. 52.
61. *Me rather had* my heart might feel your love,
 Than my unpleased eye see your courtesy. R. II. 3. 3.

When the subject or object denotes some part of the body, instead of the possessive pronoun the Old-English generally uses the personal pronoun in the dative case.

62. Pors stont and is agramed—
Colour him chaungeth syndel for drede
 And with gret ire to heom he seide. K. Alis. 7315.
63. Vor Sir William Mautravers (thonk nabbe he non)
Carf him off fet and hande. R. Glou. 159.
64. *Well many* he cleft the sholder bon. Octavian, 1643.
65. She light adoun and falleth *him* to fete.
 Chau. M. of Lawes Tale, 1095.

We have the same idiom in most of the other Gothic languages; in the Dutch, as *ik wasch mij de handen*, I wash my hands; and in the German, *dem könige wird der linke arm zerschmettert*, the king's left arm was crushed. It prevails also in the Spanish, *me duele la cabeza*, literally, the head aches me; *yo le lavé las manos*, literally, I washed her the hands; and also in the French, *vous me coupez le doigt*, &c. Indeed in some of the early Romance dialects this kind of construction was applied so generally, that the possessive pronouns were very rarely used. It is also a well-known Latin idiom.

In the examples last quoted, the dative denotes the person to whom something belongs; it is also used to indicate some advantage or benefit accruing.

66. To Athenes shalt thou wende,
 Ther is *thee* shapen of thy wo an ende.
 Chau. Knightes Tale, 534.
67. ——— draw *thee* waters for the siege. Nahum. 3. 14.
68. Command
 That out of these hard stones be made *thee* bread.
 P. R. 1. 344.

69. Heo housede and bulde faste and crede and sewe,
Sa þat in lutel while gode cornes *hem grew*,
Corn and fruyt *hem wex* ynow. R. Gl. 21.

70. Better *groued** *me* no this yere,
At yere time I sew fare corn,
Yet was it sicke when it was shorne.
Townley, Myst. Mact. Abel.

Closely connected with this idiom is another, in which the dative merely indicates some concern or interest on the part of the person whom it represents.

71. Icc hafe don swa summ þu bad and forþedte þin wille,
I have done e'en as thou bad'st and forwarded thee thy will.
Ormulum.

72. I will roar *you* as gently as any sucking dove, I will roar *you* an
t'were any nightingale.—M. N. D. 1. 2.

73. Now play *me* Nestor—hem and stroke thy beard,
'Tis Nestor right! now play him *me* Patroclus,
Arming to answer in a night alarm. Tr. and Cr. 1. 3.

74. Villain, I say, knock *me* at this gate,
And rap *me* well. Tam. of the Shrew, 1. 2.

75. Come you are a tedious fool; to the purpose—What was done to
Elbow's wife that he has cause to complain of? Come *me* to what was
done to her.—M. for M. 2. 1.

76. There's the way, Frank,
And in the tail of these fright *me* the kingdom
With a sharp prognostication. B. and Fl. Wit without Money.
Cutts is in metre something harsh to read,
Place *me* the valiant Gouran in his stead.
Prior to Mons. Boileau Despreaux.

This *dativus ethicus*, for such is the name that has been given to it, is to be found in most of the Gothic languages. It is also well known to the Latin, *Quid mihi Celsus agit?* &c. In our own language it was used so profusely, that it seems at last to have dwindled into a mere expletive.

77. —he will weep *you*, an't were a man born in April.—Tr. and Cr. 1. 2.

78. —the Hotspur of the north, he that kills *me* some six or seven
dozen of Scots at a breakfast, &c.—1 H. IV. 2. 1.

79. —my father hath made her mistress of the feast, and she lays it on
—she hath made *me* four-and-twenty nosegays for the shearers, &c.—Win-
ter's Tale, 4. 2.

The dative is also used to designate the person on whose account some emotion is felt; as in Latin we have the phrases *timeo tibi*, *volo tibi*, &c.

80. The sins of the father are to be laid upon the children, therefore I
promise you, I *fear you*.—M. of Ven. 3. 5.

* *Groued* is a dialectical variety of *grow'd*, used as the past tense of *grow*.

81. The king is sickly, weak and melancholy,
And his physicians *fear him* mightily. R. III. 1. 1.
82. Broder ther is none here aboute
That *wold the* any grefe. Townl. Myst. Mact. Abel.
83. The chambre was honged with cloth of gold,
As that maister *him wold*. K. Alis. 372.

In Ex. 83 we have the dative of the reflective pronoun. The dative of this pronoun very often follows verbs signifying fear, caution or forethought.

84. ——— an enemy unto you all,
And no great friend, *I fear me*, to the king. 2 H. VI. 1. 1.
85. And eke the dores clattereden ful faste,
Of which *Arcita* somewhat *him agaste*.
Chau. Knightes Tale, 1576.
86. But ther is better lif in other place
That never shal be lost, *ne drede the nought*.
Chau. Second Nonnes Tale, 323.
87. Of cursing ought *eche guilty man him drede*.
Chau. Prol. 664.
88. And if the folk therein be trewe vnto the,
Doute the of non enmys that comes upon the. R. Br. 41.
89. *Care the* nought, quoth the losyngoure,
I am Ammonis messenger. K. Alis. 434.
90. How that I tend, *rek the* never a deille. Townl. Myst. 13.
91. Does it not, *think thee*, stand me now upon? Hamlet, 5. 2.
92. ——— *he schulde hym habbe y þoȝt*, þat þoȝ me he was above.
R. Gl. 57.
93. he himself,
Insatiable of glory, had lost all,
Yet of another plea *bethought him* soon. P. R.

In the Anglo-Saxon, a vast number of neuter verbs take after them a dative of the reflective pronoun. It sometimes seems to be added for the sake of emphasis, but often, like the *dativus ethicus*, is a mere expletive. It is by no means unfrequent in the Old-English, particularly after verbs signifying motion.

94. This knave *goth him* up ful sturdeley.
Chau. Milleres Tale, 248.
95. And to the hors he *goth him* faire and well
And stripeth of the bridel. Chau. Reves Tale, 142.
96. hii wende and tounes nome,
So that atte last to Estangle aȝen *him come*. R. Gl. 263.
97. so euelle he þam led,
þe monkes of Canterburie fro þer cloistere þam fled.
R. Br. 209.
98. As y *me rod* this ender day
By grene wode to seche play, &c.
Harl. MS. 2253. 69.

99. And to the launde he *rideth him* ful right.
Chau. Knightes Tale, 833.

100. I *followed me* close—and with a thought seven of the eleven I paid.—1 H. IV. 2. 4.

101. He was a knight of gret pouste
And well belouyd in that contre,
Both of more and of lesse,
For *him followyd* all goodnesse. Ypomydon, 38.

102. Up *her ros* that swete wight
Into the gardine sche went ful right.
Am. & Amiloun, 529.

103. Tho this charme y do was
Up *hire ros* Olympias. Kyng Alis. 408.

The verb *to sit** often takes a dative of the reflective pronoun, even in our later literature.

104. Come *sit thee* down upon this flowery bed. M. N. D. 4. 1.

105. The happiest youth —
Would shut the book, and *sit him* down and die. Shaksp.

106. They *sat them* down to weep. P. L.

In the Old-English the same dative sometimes follows the verbs *to seem* and *to shine*.

107. The lady byheld Ipomydon,
Hym semyd wele a gentil man.
Lyfe of Ypomydon, 280.

108. But well was seen her colour,
That she had lived in languor;
Her seemed to have the jaundice
Not half so pale was Avarice.
Chau. Rom. of the Rose.

109. Where houed an hondred, in houes of selke,
Serjauntez as *hem semed*, þat serven at þe barre.
P. Ploughman, Harl. MS. 2376.

110. The somers day was fair and bright,
The sonne *him schon* thurch lem of light
That semly was on to se. Am. & Amiloun, 582.

In Ex. 107, 108, 109, the subject is omitted. As the reflective pronoun points out the person, there is the less necessity for any nominative, and its ellipsis is very common. We have another instance in Ex. 101.

In the Anglo-Saxon this dative was not unfrequently joined to the verb-substantive: "thus ferdon ealne thone winter, and thone lencten *wæron him* on Cent & betton heora scipu;" thus went they all the winter, and the spring were they in Kent, and repaired their ships, &c. S. Chron. A.D. 1009. In the Danish we have the same idiom: "*jeg har været mig* in den lund;" I have been me in the

* In our dictionaries, *to sit*, *to bethink*, &c. are represented as sometimes used actively.

grove. Moll. Dict. *Mig.* In our Old-English dialect it is occasionally met with.

111. O thoughte he, *her was a schrewe.*

The Seuyng Sages, 1798.

We may, perhaps, translate the phrase, *I followed me* into *I followed—for my part*. The construction is not unlike that into which the French emphatic dative enters, *moi, j'irai*. In the following example the resemblance to the French idiom is still more striking.

112. And *you*, be ye fruitful and multiply. Gen. ix. 7.

When there are two datives, the French verb requires a nominative, *ma femme et moi nous irons*; unless both datives be of the same person, *mon frère et lui sont arrivés*. In English the ellipsis was more frequently admitted.

113. For this, from stiller seats we come,
Our parents and us twain. Cymb. 5. 4.

114. Mark my counsel,
Which must be ev'n as swiftly follow'd as
I mean to utter it, or both *yourself and me*
Cry lost. Winter's Tale, 1. 2.

115. Then I —
Both for myself and them (but chief of all
Your safety, for the which *myself and them*
Bend their best studies) heartily entreat, &c.
K. John, 4. 2.

116. Scotland and *me* 's in great affliction.
Burns' Earnest Cry and Prayer.

117. *My wife and me* is going to London to-morrow. Forby, 141.

The *is* in Ex. 116, 117, is the plural verb of our northern dialects.

It is most probable that such phrases as *you are, you live, &c.* grew out of the syntax we are now discussing, and that *you* was originally a dative, the real nominative being omitted. The second person singular enters into a similar construction in some of our provincial dialects—*thee art, &c.* This idiom is now so generally used by the Quakers, that some of them object to the substitution of *thou* on the ground of its being "formal." It is probable, however, that the dative of the pronoun was first introduced as affording an oblique and therefore a more deferential mode of address. Daily use must have changed its character, and the deferential form has now become the familiar.

When an adjective agrees with the subject (whether expressed or understood), it seems to be a rule of Anglo-Saxon syntax always to place the adjective after the dative of the reflective pronoun, as *he arn him self*, he ran himself; and *pa circlican peawas him sylf þær getæhte*, and there he himself taught the church-customs. Hence, probably*, we get the Old-English idioms, *me self, the self, him self, &c.*

* The reason for some doubt being entertained in this case will appear shortly.

118. Y schal him sle *meself* this day. Am. & Amiloun, 2063.

119. They eaten and drank and made hem glade,
And the kyng *hymself* hem bade. Ric. C. de Lion, 114.

In Anglo-Saxon, as is well known, *sylf* takes all the inflexions of an adjective, and like any other adjective agrees with its pronoun in case and number: *ic sylf*, I myself; *we sylfe*, we ourselves, &c.; and indeed *self* is still commonly used as an adjective in our modern literature. *Vide* Johns. Dict. But the neuter adjective *sylf* was sometimes used substantively, and we find the possessive pronouns agreeing with it, as they would with any other substantive. Hence came the Old-English forms *mi self*, *thi self*, &c.*, which should be carefully distinguished from the related forms, *me-self*, *the self*, &c.

Instead of the indefinite we often find *sylf* taking the definite declension, whether it be joined to a noun or pronoun: *ic sylfa*, I myself; *pu sylfa*, thou thyself; *Lameh sylfa*, Lamech himself, &c. This need not surprise us, when we remember that *sylf* is always used for the purposes of emphasis, and that the definite is properly the emphatic declension. Hence we get the Old-English forms *me selve*, *the selve*, *him selve*, *our selve*, &c.

120. Litel ye conne, par ma fai,
But echen of yo mai saue me a dai,
The aighteden dai ich *meselue*, &c. Seuyn Sages, 384.

121. Do with *meselfe* what ye will,
Wheder ye wyll me save or spyll—
So that ye will my ladye save. Sir Amadas, 674.

122. And the kyng *hymselve* bad
That his daughter wer forth fette, &c. R. C. de Lion, 104.

123. All my joye is turnyd to woo,
For sorwe I wole *my selve* sloo. R. C. de Lion, 824.

124. Syre, heo seyde, wel ychot þat ȝoure herte vþ me ys
More vor myn erytage, þan *my sulue* ywys. R. Gl. 431.

It has been observed in a former paper†, that the declension of the definite adjective was the same as the *æ* declension; and that in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries nouns of the *æ* declension often took the nunnation in the nominative in place of the usual vowel-ending. Hence came the *hemselven*, *myselven*, &c. of Chaucer.

Another adjective, which is often found coupled with the pronoun personal, is *an*, alone—the Old-English *on*.

* Tyrwhitt believed that the "metaphysical substantive" *self* did not exist in the days of Chaucer, but it is found in our literature in common use at least six centuries before the time of that poet, and may very possibly have been brought from the shores of the Caspian. The use of an abstract term instead of the concrete, when addressing or speaking of an individual, has prevailed from a remote antiquity in the Gothic languages, and in our own language was particularly common during the sixteenth century. *Your self* (that is *your identity*) must be classed with such phrases as *your worship*, *her majesty*, *his reverend fatherhood*, Dr. Faustus, 3. 1, *my uncle's grace*. R. III. 2. 3. &c.

† See No. 6, p. 74.

125. And þer nys no mor þat kynde haþ þerto bute þou on.
R. Gl. 101.

It is, however, more generally found in its definite form *ana*—Old-English *one*.

126. The kyng *one* on þe morn went to London
His ȝole forto hold. R. Br. 49.
127. Pycars fonden ese ynow and defaut none
To libbe in plente y now, bute of wymmen *one*. R. Gl. 42.
128. Nou sauh but *he ane*. R. Br. 44.
129. For þou art my doȝter and ich habbe more þan þi sustren boþe
Y loued þe *one*. R. Gl. 31.

This adjective, like *selfe*, always follows the dative of the reflective pronoun.

130. — he made his mone
Within a garden all *him one*. Gower, Conf. Am.
131. The kinge——
Tho stode as who saith, all *him one*
Withoute wyfe. Gower, Conf. Am. l. viii.
132. But the gret pairt to yow tuk ye
That slew four of the fyve *you ane*. The Bruce, 5. 285.

Like *selve* also, *one* was often used as a substantive: *myn one*, literally, *my singleness*.

133. In this world wote I no knyght,
Who durst *his one* with hym fyght.
Lyf of Ipomydon, 1690.
134. pah ha *hire ane* were
Ayein so kene keisere and al his kine riche.
Though she were alone
Against so fierce a kaiser and all his kingdom.
St. Catherine, 90.

In Ex. 130, 131, we have the adverb *all* joined in construction with the adjective *one*. From this syntax came the compound *alone*, which was gradually corrupted into '*lone*. The compound *alone* or '*lone* enters into the same constructions as *one*.

135. And band her *him alane*. Felon Sowe.
136. And he went forth *him alone*,
And all vanquish'd came he home. Sir Grey-Steel, 50.
137. They were not brethren born,
But they were brethren sworn;
They had a chamber *them alone*,
Better loved never none. Sir Grey-Steel, 45.
138. Hys douchtyr succede sall in his stede
And hold his herytage *hyr alane*. Wynt. 8. 4. 323.

139. It was an awkward thing for a woman-body to be standing, &c., *her lane*, selling saddles, bridles, &c.—W. Scott, H. of Mid Lothian.

140. I amaist never sleep till my bonny lady Moon gangs till her bed.—Mair by taken, when she 's at the full ye ken, rowing aboon us yonder in

her grand silver coach.—I have danced to her *my lane* sometimes for very joy.—W. Scott, H. of Mid Lothian.

141. He's happy that leevs aw *his leane*
 Compared wi' chaps like me.
 The ill-gien Wife, Anderson's Cumb. Ballads.
142. Solitar walking *your alone*
 Seing naething but stock or stone, &c.
 Dunbar's Dirige to the King.

Wiclif, in the nominative case, uses the forms *weself*, *gheself*, which answer exactly to the Dutch *wij zelf*, *gij zelf*. In the objective case he has *ussilf* and *ghousilf*, while the Dutch has *ons zelf** and *uw zelf*. The absence of any adjectival inflexion might lead us to infer that *silf* was a substantive put in apposition to the pronoun, and this hypothesis derives support from the particular inflexion which the Dutch *zelf* takes in the genitive singular of the second person—*uws zelf-s*, of you yourself. It was a common practice in the Old-English to make one substantive qualify another, and we often have the word *self* employed, as it would seem, for this very purpose.

143. ——— thought
 She were the *ladye selfe* † whom he so long had sought.
 F. Q. 3. 8.
144. ——— they found the *goodman self*
 Full beesily unto his work ybent. F. Q. 4. 5. 24.
145. Lo here the man, who not of usual earth,
 But of that nobler and more precious mould,
 Which *Phæbus self* doth temper, is composed.
 B. Jons. Cynthia's Revels, 5. 8:

The use of *ghousilf* and *ussilf* in the objective case explains itself, but we also find the forms *we ussilf* and *ghe ghouself*. In these phrases, *us* and *ghou* must represent the datives of the reflective pronoun.

146. —ech creature sorowith and traueilith with peyne til ghith, and not oonli it, but also *we ussilf* that han the firste fruytis of the spyryt, and *we ussilf* sorewen, &c.—Wiclif, Romayns 8.

The substantive *self* was commonly used in the singular number, even when it referred to several individuals.

147. ——— us ———
 pat bep hire bi *oure self*, as at þe worldes ende, &c. R. Gl. 46.
148. Is not thilk same a goat-herd proud
 That sits on yonder bank,
 Whose straying sheep *themselves* doth shroud
 Among the bushes rank? Spenser.

But as precision was more studied, it gradually became the cus-

* So the Danish has in the nominative *vi selv*, and in the objective case *os selv*.

† The use of these abstract terms without the possessive pronoun—the *ladye self* instead of the *ladye herself*—might easily be illustrated from our older writers; thus when he addresses John, the French herald speaks "to *the Majesty* of England." K. John 1. 1. &c.

tom to put *self* in the plural, and we have the forms *ourselves*, *themselves*, &c. Tyrwhitt's notion, that these forms were corrupted from the *ourselven*, *themselven*, &c. of Chaucer, is quite untenable. It is sufficient to observe, that such hypothesis assumes the existence of a letter-change, which is unknown to our language.

We may now understand the doubt which exists as to the origin of the terms *meself*, *theself*, *himself*. If the second element of *themselves* be a substantive, *self* may also be a substantive in *meself*, &c. To settle this doubt would require a very minute and careful examination of our older dialect; but the probability is, that in such cases *self* is an adjective.

As the constructions into which the word *self* enters are in our language singularly intricate and difficult, it may be well to observe that we sometimes meet in Anglo-Saxon with the genitive *sylfes*: as *mines sylfes lic*, the body of myself. This idiom was used by the early Flemish writers, and will probably be found in our Old-English, as in that dialect of our language we have the parallel form *his anes*.

149. Nu is alre schome meast
That an lepi meiden wið *hire anes muð** haneð
Swa biteuelet, &c.

Now is the greatest shame of all,
That a solitary maiden with her single mouth hath
So confounded, &c. St. Catherine, 1290.

150. Ah habbich *thin anes* help, ich am wil cweme.
But if I have thy single help, I am well content.
Roy. Lib. 17. A. xxvii. f. 61.

* *Hire anes muð*, literally rendered, is equivalent to *the mouth of her singleness*.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

MAY 24, 1844.

No. 23.

Professor WILSON in the Chair.

The following works were laid on the table :—

“On the Eastern Terminus of the Wall of Antoninus.” By the Rev. Richard Garnett. Presented by the author.

“Apposition St. Paul’s School, 1844”; and “Prolusiones Literariæ Præmiis Quotannis Propositis Dignatæ et in D. Pauli Schola Comitibus Majoribus Habitæ Die Maii viii. A. S. H. MDCCCXLIV.” Presented by the Rev. H. Kynaston.

The following gentlemen were elected Members of the Society :—

The Chevalier Bunsen.

Francis H. Dickenson, Esq., M.P.

A paper was then read :—

“On the Origin and Import of the Augment in Sanscrit and Greek.” By the Rev. Richard Garnett.

It has long been suspected that the vowel-prefix to certain past tenses (Sanscr. *a*, Gr. *ε*) was originally a distinct element, potentially modifying the signification of the verb in its expression of the various relations of *time*. Not to dwell upon its restriction to particular tenses, it may be briefly observed, that in the older compositions in Sanscrit it is sometimes omitted, and sometimes separated from the verbal theme and placed between two prepositions. In Greek, the Ionic and Æolic dialect frequently reject it altogether; and in certain verbs compounded with prepositions it is not unfrequently prefixed to the preposition instead of the radical portion of the verb. All these phænomena seem totally inconsistent with the idea of its being any integral part of the verbs to which it is joined; as it is notorious, that though the constituent parts of compound terms may be disjoined by tmesis, the elements of truly simple words never are. Various theories have been advanced by grammarians to account for the origin and ascertain the precise force of this prefix. Some, confining their views to the Greek language, suppose it to have originated in the imperfect of the verb substantive, ἦν or ἦ, *was*; an hypothesis involving a gross solecism, and subversive of all the established analogies of the Indo-European languages. Buttmann conjectures it to be nothing more than a mutilation of the reduplicate prefix of the perfect, so that ἐτυπτον was originally τέτυπτον. Though this idea might appear to derive some countenance from the epic forms of the second aorist, in which the syllabic augment and the reduplication appear to be employed almost indifferently, a slight comparison with the analogous forms in Sanscrit will show it to be to-

tally untenable. Pott also regards the augment as a sort of imitation of the reduplication, but does not adduce any arguments in support of his position that appear of much cogency. Bopp has advanced an hypothesis, which has, at all events, the merit of originality—not to say singularity. He supposes the augment to be identical with the negation prefix *a* or *an* (Gr. *ἀ*, *ἀν*), so that *ἔλεγον* for instance is to be resolved into *ἀ-λεγον*, *I say no longer* = *I said*; the prefix not conveying a negation of the action, but simply of its *present occurrence*. In the last published part of his 'Vergleichende Grammatik,' Bopp labours to vindicate his theory against some severe and cogent remarks of Lassen in the 'Indische Bibliothek'; but his defence is more remarkable for its learning and ingenuity than for its success in convincing the reader. He himself, indeed, seems to have some misgivings respecting the soundness of his hypothesis, since he admits that the prefix in question may be only collaterally related to the negative particle, as being derived from the same demonstrative pronominal root; and that, instead of denying the actual presence of the action, it may merely affirm its remoteness. He affects indeed to consider the two solutions as virtually identical; to which it is sufficient to reply, that the latter hypothesis is completely subversive of the former, and that the same element could hardly signify *that, there, yonder, then*, affirmatively, and express, *vi termini*, a negative proposition at the same moment. The object of the present paper is to show that the explanation which Bopp himself allows to be admissible,—namely, that the augment may be regarded as a demonstrative particle, primarily expressing *remote place*, and secondarily *remote time*,—is the one which unites the most probabilities in its favour. One cannot help feeling some surprise at the extremely limited view which has hitherto been taken of this question. Some have confined their investigations to the Greek, which gives absolutely no data for deciding the point: others have gone no further than the Sanscrit, which does not furnish any very satisfactory ones. The most rational and philosophical method of proceeding would have been to inquire how the same modification of time is expressed in other languages, especially those cognate with Greek and Sanscrit. If we find that any of those distinguish the past from the present by means of prefixes, and further, that those prefixes have a distinct meaning, suitable to the functions which they discharge, it is, *à priori*, very possible that the augment in Greek and Sanscrit may be of similar origin and similar import.

The Latin language will not afford us any assistance in this investigation; since, though it has partially retained the reduplication, it exhibits in its present state no distinct traces of a syllabic augment, or substitute for one. If we proceed to the Celtic, we shall find that all the dialects regularly form the preterite by the aid of prefixes, some of which are plainly significant. These preformatives are pretty numerous in Welsh, especially in ancient poetical compositions; but the one most commonly employed is *a*; *e. gr.* *canu*, to sing; *a ganodd*, cecinit; *caru*, to love; *a garodd*, amavit. In old manuscripts the particle is regularly joined to the verb in writing;

aorug, he made, or did; *aganodd*, he sung; so that, had this orthography been persisted in, the prefix would have appeared as integral a part of the verb as *a* in Sanscr., *atudat*, or *ε* in Gr., *ἔτυπτε*.

The precise force of the Welsh element in this combination can only be inferred by analogical reasoning. As a pronoun, *a* denotes *who, which, that*; as a preposition, *with*; and as a conjunction, *and*. Reasons will be produced in the course of the present paper for believing that its original import was *there, or then*; denoting with greater precision the *time* of the action expressed by the verb. That it had a distinct meaning may be inferred from its changing the initial of the verb to which it is joined: *a ganodd* from *canu*; *a dorrodd*, broke, from *torri*. This phænomenon in the Celtic languages almost invariably denotes a grammatical or logical relation; namely, government, concord, composition or other modification of a word by something in immediate conjunction with it. It would be contrary to the analogy of the language to suppose that this effect could be produced by a *verbum otiosum*, or mere expletive.

Though *a* is sometimes used in Irish as a sign of the preterite tense, it is of comparatively unfrequent occurrence. The particle most commonly employed is *do*, which is seldom omitted, except when the verb precedes its subject. As a particle, *do* signifies *to*, and is employed as the sign of the dative and the infinitive. In ancient Irish we find greater variety of particles, and sometimes a combination of them, employed for the same purpose. *At, ad, no, ro, ad no, do no*, and *do ro* seem to be used indiscriminately, except that sometimes the compound forms may have the idea of greater precision or emphasis annexed to them. *No* and *do no* are interpreted by the lexicographers to signify *then*, which we believe to be the real import of most of those formative particles, the Greek and Sanscrit augment included. The prefix *ro* has its exact counterpart in the Welsh *rhy*, often used by old writers to form the perfect, pluperfect and future tenses. The element is significant in both languages as a particle implying *excess, what is over and above, or further*; and appears, when joined with verbs, to answer pretty accurately to our *moreover*. We may here remark the similarity of the Homeric particle *ῥά*, so frequently used in transitions. The common idea, that this word was formed by aphæresis from *ἄρα*, is both gratuitous and contrary to analogy. We believe the opinion of Mr. Donaldson in the 'New Cratylus,' who regards it as an independent term, implying *addition, excess, remoteness*, both alone and in composition, to be much better founded. It is indeed just as easy to affirm that *ἄρα* is a compound, as that *ῥά* is an abbreviation.

The Gothic language exhibits a few instances of reduplication in preterites; but, with the exception of the particle *ga*, which will be noticed hereafter, neither it nor any other Germanic dialect has any thing formally corresponding to the augment. There is, however, a curious analogy in Upper German, which, if it had occurred to Bopp, might possibly have made him doubt the soundness of his theory respecting the negative import of the augment. Both in Old

and Middle High German we find the particles *tho*, *do*, *ther*, *der*, prefixed to verbs in the past tense, without any special reference to the idea of *then* or *there*, but simply, as it would seem, to denote the completion of the action. In translations from the Latin it frequently corresponds to the preterite in that language, unaccompanied by any particle. Thus in 'Iatian's 'Evangelical Harmony,' we find "*quad tho* Maria" = *dixit* Maria; "*tho* ward gitruobit" = *turbatus est*; "*tho ther* stigun sine bruoder" = *ut autem ascenderunt fratres ejus*. In the writings of the middle ages we find *do* and *der* employed nearly in the same manner. In the first edition of the Upper German Bible, A.D. 1462, are twenty examples of this construction in the first chapter of Genesis; as for example, ver. 3-4, "Un Got *der* sprach (*dixit*) liecht werde gemacht. Und das liecht ward gemacht; un Got *der* sache (*vidit*) daz liecht das es ward gut." So *der* rieff = *vocavit*; *der* macht = *fecit*; *der* beschuoff = *creavit*, &c. &c. Not only *der*, but also *hin* and *her* are frequently joined to verbs and participles in Middle High German to increase the emphasis and show that the action is done thoroughly.

The verb in the Slavonic languages presents some remarkable phenomena, well worthy the consideration of the philologist. It is known that in this class of tongues a regular, perfectly philosophical distinction is made between perfective and imperfective verbs, that is, between those expressing an action completed at once and not repeated, and those denoting continuance or reiteration. Thus *to dig*, implying a continued action, is regarded as imperfective; but *to bury*, which is done only once to the same subject, is a proper perfective. Sometimes this distinction is inherent in the form of the verb; but in many cases, verbs naturally imperfective, become perfective in the preterite by prefixing a preposition. What particular preposition may be employed with individual verbs depends on the custom of the language; those denoting *out*, *from*, *by*, *with*, *after*, are most commonly in use. Thus *kropliù*, I besprinkle, might denote a *habit* of so doing; to express a single definite act of it, already accomplished, would require *po* or *na* (after) to be prefixed to the simple preterite. The future perfect is formed in a similar manner by prefixing some one of the above-mentioned particles to the present tense. In all those compound phrases a sort of feeling appears to prevail, that the particle is necessary to convey the idea of completeness of action or precision of time, and in a great many cases the Slavonic preterite perfective would correspond pretty accurately with the Greek or Sanscrit aorist, used definitely.

The only remaining European language which seems to offer any analogy is the Albanian, which forms the future by prefixing *do te* to the present: e. gr. *thom*, I say, *do te thom*, I shall say. As a particle of place *do* signifies *where*; if transferred to express the idea of *time*, it would naturally denote *when* or *then*, which may be employed with equal propriety in a future or past acceptation. Thus the Irish *ro* = moreover, is used with preterites, and its counterpart, the Welsh *rhy*, both with the preterite and future.

The languages of Central Asia also present a few analogies. The ancient Armenian prefixes *e* to the preterite, exactly like the Greek; but this formation is confined to the third person of one particular conjugation. The Kurdish also employs several particles in the formation of past tenses; as *che kiria*, fecit, from the root *ken*, make, &c. We have no means of ascertaining whether those particles have a distinct meaning, or what it is. In Persian the particle *be* or *bu*, prefixed to the present, converts it to a future: *pursem*, I ask, *bupursem*, I shall or will ask. The Georgian also employs a variety of preformative particles in conjugation, but the precise analysis of them has not hitherto been made known.

In the Coptic language the system of verbal preformatives is more fully developed than in any of the Indo-European. Every tense has its appropriate particle, apparently meant to express the particular modification of time supposed to be included in the entire phrase. Thus *e* is the sign of the present tense; *na* of the imperfect; *a* of the preterite definite; *sha* of the preterite indefinite; *ne a* and *ne sha* of the pluperfect; *e-na* the future; *ta* or *ta-re* the future indefinite, &c. It is true that several grammarians regard those prefixes as auxiliary verbs; but there are reasons, which we cannot here discuss at length, for believing that most of them are of pronominal origin. The particle *ent* or *et*, used in one of the preterite formations, is confessedly identical with the relative pronoun in form; and Benfey admits that they are, in all probability, of common origin.

In the languages of Southern India the system of verbal formatives expressing the time of the action is carried to a great extent. Thus Anderson observes (Rudiments of Tamul Grammar, page 44), "The Tamul grammarians resolve most of the derivative forms of a verb into three parts; viz. *paghudi* the root, *vighudi* the form of termination [distinguishing the persons], and *ideimilei* the intermediate argument, which is generally employed as the formative of the different tenses." MacKerrell also remarks (Grammar of the Carnāta Language, p. 85), "Verbs in the Carnāta language, whether possessing an intransitive or a transitive meaning, are conjugated by adding to their roots, in three of the tenses (viz. present, past and future), certain affixes expressive of *time*; and to these the affixes denoting persons being attached, the inflexion is complete." The particles thus employed are pretty numerous, and the rules for the application of them are rather intricate; but it is obvious that they are all regulated by the same general principle, of specifying the *time* of the action more precisely than could be done by merely using the verbal root with its personal affixes.

The Polynesian languages, especially those of the eastern division, furnish copious and valuable materials for the illustration of the point in question. The whole conjugation of the verb—as far as distinction of tense is concerned—depends on the employment of certain particles, which, allowing for the difference of dialect and pronunciation, are nearly common to the great body of the east insular Polynesians, properly so called. A minute account of them

will be found in Humboldt and Buschmann's great work, 'Ueber die Kawi Sprache:' it will be sufficient for us to observe, by way of specimen, that in Tahitian the present is generally distinguished by the particle *aei* and the preterite by *aa*. The original import of *aei*, as a local particle, is *here*, and its derivative one, as an adverb of time, *now*; which shows at once its force as a formative of the present tense. *Na* in like manner signifies, as a separate particle, *there* and *then*, and is employed to express the preterite tense in a way exactly analogous to the "*der sprach*" of the Middle High German. In Kawi and Tagala this prefix is regularly incorporated with the verb. Kawi, *hem*, assemble; pret. *nahem*, assembled: Tagala, *pinta*, demand; pret. *naminta*, demanded—*p* being converted into *n* by an euphonic process well known to Malay scholars. It is obvious that the circumstance of the prefix being incorporated in writing in these latter dialects, is one of the accidents of language, or a mere orthographical fashion, and makes no difference as to the actual force of the particle, which we may safely conclude to convey the sense of *then* in all cases where it is used to denote an action that is past.

Passing over other languages of this family, we shall briefly observe, that the most western one, the Malagasy, forms its tenses with remarkable neatness and precision by prefixing the particle *mi* for the present, *ni* for the preterite, and *hi* for the future; e. gr. *solo* (verbal root) = substitution; *misolo* (aho), I substitute; *nisolo*, I substituted; *hisolo*, I shall substitute. When we take into consideration the undoubted affinity of the languages, there can be little question that these particles have the same force as the Tahitian, Philippine and Javanese prefixes already specified. The idea of precision of *time* is carried so far by the Malagasy, that they even combine it with local particles. Respecting this peculiarity Mr. Freeman observes, "The want of a substantive verb, corresponding with the *esse* of the Latins, and to be employed in the same manner, is compensated in many cases by a mode of structure which prevails extensively in the Malagasy language, and which constitutes one of its marked peculiarities; namely, that of making adverbs and prepositions susceptible of tense or time, by distinguishing the past from the present*." Thus *amy* and *tamy* both have the general signification of *at*, *with*, *by*; but to express the idea of *present* time, "*is with*," *amy* would be employed; while *tamy* would include the category of *past* time, "*was with*:" e. gr. "*ny mazava mahazava ao amy ny maizina*," the light *shineth* in darkness; but with a past signification, "*ny Teny tamy n'Andriamanitra*," the Word *was* with God. This may serve as an instance, among innumerable others, that languages commonly reputed barbarous may not be without their refinements.

It would far exceed our limits to attempt anything like an individual discussion of the numerous languages of the American continent. It will be sufficient to observe that most of those respecting

* Observations on the Malagasy Language, ap. Ellis. History of Madagascar, vol. i. p. 499.

which we possess definite information bear a general analogy to the Polynesian family and the languages of the Deccan, in their methods of distinguishing the various modifications of time. In the Araucanian *che* is the sign of the second present; *bu* of the imperfect; *uye* of the imperfect; *a* of the future, and *abu* of the aorist. In many cases those formative particles have a determinate signification; e. gr. in Guarani, *bià* or *bihà* = afterwards, forms the imperfect, and *raco* = already, or *naco* = certainly, the perfect, provided it speaks of a circumstance which the narrator has seen. In some instances those distinctive particles are interposed between the verbal root and the personal termination, and sometimes those three constituents are so thoroughly incorporated that it requires a careful analysis to separate them. We may, however, venture to assert in general terms, that a South American verb is constituted precisely on the same principle as those in the Tamul and other languages of Southern India; consisting like them of a verbal root, a second element defining the time of the action, and a third denoting the subject or person.

The object of the foregoing remarks is to endeavour to establish the point of a frequent employment of particles determining more or less precisely the *time* of the action expressed by verbs, in a great variety of languages. In many cases those particles, though no original part of the verbal root, are essential to the integrity of the verbal phrase, which could not predicate time or completed action without them. Some of them, for instance the Celtic and Coptic *a*, agree exactly in form with the Sanscrit augment, there being no external difference between Sanscr. *as'ranshit* = Gr. *ἐκλυε* and the Welsh *aglywai* or *aglybu*, *audivit*, written as it was once the practice to write them. The identity of the Celtic element with the Sanscrit one cannot perhaps be proved by any direct evidence now within our reach. We are aware that the Indian grammarians represent the augment as being destitute of signification in itself; and arguments from the analogy of other languages are all that we have to oppose to this assertion. Those which we have adduced are not, it is presumed, entirely destitute of weight; and they form only a small portion of the evidence bearing upon this point which might be collected. It would be easy to affirm that the Gothic particle *ga*, Germ. *ge*, which never appears out of composition, has no original independent meaning; but it is imagined that no one would persist in that opinion after carefully comparing the different dialects, and observing how frequently it modifies the sense and the circumstances of propositions. One of its functions is exactly equivalent to that of the Greek augment, there being a number of verbs exhibiting simple forms in the present, but regularly prefixing *ga* or *ge* to form the preterite and the past participle. The actual import of this particle can only be inferred from analogy. Grimm has adduced strong reasons for believing it to be cognate with the Latin *cum*, to which it is clearly equivalent in *ga-sintha*, companion, co-itinerant, from *sinthan*, to go or travel, and many similar compounds. As a formative of the preterite, it may be presumed to be parallel

with the Slavonic *s'* = with, employed much in the same way: e. gr. *beregù*, I am considering; perf. *sbereg*, I have (fully) considered.

After all, the strongest argument in favour of the theory now advocated is, that the great majority of prefixes in all known languages are evidently significant; and that our being unable to trace the derivation or meaning of a few only proves our want of information. It may be said that many of the analogies that have been adduced are from barbarous languages, and consequently of little weight. To this it is easy to reply, that the ancestors of the Greeks were at one period much more barbarous than the Malays or Javanese of the present day, and that the languages of uncivilized races are not necessarily deficient in regularity of structure or propriety of expression. And if, as there is good reason to believe, such languages often show the original force of the component parts of words more clearly than those which have been subject to a long process of refinement, that very circumstance shows that the philosopher and the comparative etymologist may profitably include them in the compass of their researches.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

JUNE 14, 1844.

No. 24.

DANIEL SHARPE, Esq., in the Chair.

The following papers were read :—

1. "On the Formation of the Past Tense in certain of the Indo-European languages." By F. H. Trithen, Esq.

A peculiarity which distinguishes the grammar of all the Slavish languages consists in the use of the past participle taken in an active sense for the purpose of expressing the preterite. This participle generally ends in *l*; and much uncertainty prevails both as to its origin and its relations, though the termination has been compared by various philologists with similar affixes in the Sanscrit and the classical languages.

In the old Slavish, or language of the church, there are three methods of expressing the past tense; one of them consists in the union of the verb substantive with the participle: as,

rek esm'	chital esm'
rek esi	chital esi
rek est'	chital est'.

In the corresponding tense of the Slovenian dialect we have the verb substantive placed before the participle:

Yasam imao	Mi'smo imali
Ti si imao	vi'ste'imali
On ye imao	oni su imali.

In the Polish it appears as a suffix:

Czytalem	Czytalismy
Czytales	Czytaliscie
Czytal	Czytali,

and in the Servian it follows the participle:

igrao sam	igrali smo
igrao si	igrali ste
igrao ye	igrali su.

The ending *ao* of *igrao* and *imao* stands for the Russian *al*, as in some English dialects *a'* is used for *all*.

In the language of Little Russia this termination is *v*, as in *igra-v*, a form with which we may compare the Latin *ama-v-i*, where the *i* may possibly be a form of the verb substantive.

Bopp seems to have proved that the Latin termination *bam* is etymologically connected with the Sanscrit *b'ū*, to be; and it may be conjectured, that the verbal form to which it is attached was originally a past participle used in an active sense. This hypothesis may perhaps enable us to account for the length of the vowel in the imperfect of the third and fourth conjugations which has not yet been satisfactorily explained, *regēbam*, *audiēbam*.

This hypothesis seems to be confirmed by the construction of the Sanscrit preterite, where the inflexions of the auxiliary verbs *asa* to be, *b'ū* to be, and *kr* to make, are attached to a form of the verb ending in *ām* :

ed'ām-āsa ed'ām-āsīt'a ed'ām-āsa, &c. •

Bopp, in his Krit. Gram. p. 229, considers the ending *ām* to be the suffix of an abstract substantive in the accusative case, but Wilkins considers the first part of these verbal compounds as a sort of indeclinable participle, into which certain Sanscrit roots require to be changed before they take the verbal endings. There seems to be a difficulty in the way of considering *ām* as an accusative ending, inasmuch as *kr* is the only one of the auxiliaries which governs that case, and even this verb is often used in an intransitive sense, like the English *do*. But if the ending of the genitive plural *ām* answers to the Greek ending *ων*, why should not the *ām* of this Sanscrit preterite answer to *ων*, the ending of the Greek second aorist? We do not indeed meet with this participle in modern Sanscrit literature, but it is found in the Vedas; and according to Panini, iii. 1. 12, the first preterite is also used in combination with this participial form. This tense of the verb *as*, to be, is thus conjugated :

<i>Sing.</i>	āsam	āsīs	āsīt
<i>Dual.</i>	āsva	āstam	āstām
<i>Plur.</i>	āsma	āsta	āsan,

with which Bopp has proved the terminations of the third preterite to be identical. These are—

Sing.	Dual.	Plural.
sam σα	sāva	sāma σαμεν
sah σas	satam σατον	sata σate
sat σε	satām σατην	san σαν.

If the Sanscrit terminations are the inflexions of the verb *as*, to be, it seems to follow that the Greek must be so too; and it would appear probable that the body of the verb had once a participial meaning and termination. These verbal endings may be compared with those of the past tense of the Servian verb already noticed.

2. "On the Lydian Dynasty which preceded the Mermnadæ." By the Rev. O. Cockayne.

In Herodotus, i. 7, is a passage which gives some scanty modicum of historical information concerning the dynasty of kings that reigned at Sardes before the family of Kroesus. The Mermnadæ began with Gyges, B.C. 716, and ended with Kroesus, B.C. 546. The Heraklidæ preceded them, and governed the country five hundred and five years, beginning with Agron, B.C. 1220, and ending with Kandaules, B.C. 716.

This dynasty of the Heraklidæ has been pronounced by one of our ablest scholars fabulous, an expression which possibly was intended in a qualified sense. For if we understand it to mean that the assertion of Herodotus is in no degree to be relied on, we shall come

to the startling conclusion that the Greeks, who had been two hundred and seventy years in the country, had no sufficient knowledge of the lords and masters of the land in which they resided: that in the time of the poet Archilochus a revolution occurred in Sardes, but that the Greeks did not know anything worth attention concerning the deposed family.

If we take the expression in a limited sense, then we shall have an enunciation of opinion that *all* these assertions cannot be relied on. Two points of the statement have been fixed upon as indications of untruth. First, the chronological inconsistency: Herodotus places the ἀκμὴ of Hercules at 1173 B.C. when treating of Sparta, but when speaking of Lydia the computation mounts 181 years higher. We should however notice that another nation, and probably another Hercules, is spoken of. Herodotus had a theological system that assumed the identity of foreign deities with those of his native land: the Egyptian Neith is with him Athena, and Phtha is Hephæstos. The Lydian word was probably only an equivalent to the Greek Herakles. Nevertheless, Herodotus, identifying still further the father of this dynasty with the hero of Greek mythology, more specifically derives these Heraklidæ from a Lydian female, and Hercules ἐκ δούλης τε τῆς Ἰαρδάνου γεγονότες καὶ Ἡρακλέος. This story of Omphale was incorporated with the adventures of the Grecian Hercules, but its connection with them may very probably be poetical, not historical: the Lydian Hercules may have been a different person from the ancestor of the Spartan kings, and may have lived 180 years before him. Cicero says, "At primum quot hominum linguæ, tot nomina deorum. Non enim, ut tu Velleius quocumque veneris, sic idem in Italia Vulcanus, idem in Africa, idem in Hispania." N. D. i. 30. The stories about Gades, Atlas, the Hesperides, are the property of the Tyrian Hercules, who bore the Phœnician name Melikertes, king of the city, but was, by the customary process, identified with the Grecian hero; and by a similar transfer, the adventures which occurred in Lydia to the first champion who elevated the royal race to distinction may have been seized by the ready genius of Grecian poetry and embodied as attributes of the Hellenic demi-god. No valid objection therefore will lie against the historical reality of the dynasty of Kandaules, from any chronological chasm between the Hercules of Sardes and of Sparta.

A second objection to the truthfulness of Herodotus has been raised, and his account is overruled as contrary to experience. He assures us that in this family were twenty-two generations, and adds, παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκδεκόμενος τὴν ἀρχήν; son from father receiving the crown. On these words it is remarked, that "the succession...[of even]...fourteen kings in the direct line from father to son, or from grandfather to grandson, without a single instance of female or collateral succession, is a circumstance which cannot be paralleled in any single line of hereditary princes." Supposing this objection to apply in all its force to the passage before us, it overturns only a subordinate circumstance, by no means essential to the general statement. But it may be maintained, that the words

quoted do not imply that every monarch came into possession of the throne next after his father in direct and immediate descent. The value of the phrase may be tested not only by the words that compose it, which contain no assertion that every king had issue to succeed him, but also by the way in which the phrase is employed and under what circumstances. In Herodotus, ii. 65, he speaks of μελεδωνοὶ, καὶ ἔρσεες καὶ θήλειαι παῖς παρὰ πατρός ἐκδεκόμενοι τὴν τιμήν. In this instance, if the females transmitted the office, the words will not bear to be tied down strictly to fathers. In ii. 166, he applies the same expression to the descent of the military profession in the warrior caste of Egypt, but he hardly can be taken to signify that all the pedigrees were uninterrupted*. Diodorus, ii. 21, uses the same phrase of thirty kings of Assyria. Diodorus, ii. 29, says in like manner of the Chaldean soothsayers, παῖς παρὰ πατρός διαδέχεται [ταύτην τὴν φιλοσοφίαν]. In Diodorus, xix. 36, the same formula describes the transmission of the sovereignty in Epirus, which had been thus handed down from the time of Neoptolemus, son of Achilles, to Cassander, B.C. 315, and he says, this continued series was now broken; but how? by the accession of a collateral branch? by the king's dying without issue? No: but by a revolution that deposed the reigning prince. From these examples it will appear that those terms convey no more than the general idea of hereditary succession; and there is nothing repugnant to experience in a line of twenty-two monarchs of one house.

These two objections are the only grounds we have noticed, for the strong designation fabulous, applied to this early dynasty. That such a series of kings really had existence can hardly be questioned, if we consider the inquisitive spirit of the Greeks, the rapid advances made in civilization by the Asiatic colonists, who produced the earliest poets, the earliest philosophers and the earliest historians of Greece†, and lastly, the two centuries and a half which had seen them neighbours, perhaps tenants, of this very dynasty.

Barthold Niebuhr has considered these Heraklidæ to be Assyrians; and Herodotus tells us that "Agron son of *Ninus*" was the first king of Sardes. In the Scholia to the Phœnissæ, 162, as corrected by Valckenaer, we are told on the authority of Xanthus, the very ancient historian of Lydia, that the husband of Niobe was called Philottus the Assyrian, and that he dwelt at Sipylus. Valckenaer thinks that in the word Assyrian is concealed the name of Assaon, the father of Niobe. If this criticism be not admitted, we have another testimony to Assyrian princes having been settled in Lydia. It is worth notice also, that in the enumeration of the chief Asiatic races, Gen. x., Lydia is placed in close juxtaposition with Assyria.

* Herodotus uses a similar combination in ii. 143, but the passage is not a parallel, for there is an additional definition by a pronoun: παῖδα πατρός ἐαυτῶν ἕκαστον ἐόντα.

† Add also the earliest painters: "Quid quod in confesso perinde est, Bularchi pictoris tabulam in qua erat Magnetum prælium, a Candaule rege Lydiæ Heraclidarum novissimo, qui et Myrsilus vocitatus est, repensam auro? Tanta jam dignatio picturæ erat."—Pliny, N. H. xxxv. 34.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. I.

JUNE 28, 1844.

No. 25.

Professor MALDEN in the Chair.

The following paper was read :—

“ On English Pronouns Personal.” By Edwin Guest, Esq.

There is no part of English grammar attended with greater difficulty than that which relates to the personal pronouns. The syntax and the etymology of these pronouns appear to have varied with our dialects; and as any particular dialect rose into literary notice, it generally left some of its peculiar forms impressed upon our standard English. The confusion hence arising was increased by a custom which sprung up in the Old-English period of treating these pronouns as if they were, under certain circumstances, indeclinable. Attempts were made during the last century to bring these conflicting usages into order, but by men who were better acquainted with the grammar of the French and Latin than with that of their native language; and the result has been a complication of difficulties which the most sanguine philologist must approach with diffidence.

In Anglo-Saxon the first personal pronoun was represented by *ic*, a word which seems to have been corrupted in our northern dialects into *I*, and in other dialects (more particularly the southern and the western) into *ich*. *Ich* occurs too often in our older poetry to need illustration; but in the south of Somersetshire they now use as its substitute a word of two syllables, *utchy* or *iche*, “ what shall *utchy* do?” (Jennings, Gloss.) ‘*Che*, the contracted form of *iche*, is also occasionally used (Jennings, p. 11); and must at one time have been common all over the south of England, for it is put into the mouth of a Kentish peasant by Shakespeare, and of the Middlesex yeomanry by Jonson.

1. Good gentleman, go your gait, and let poor volk pass. And ch’ud ha’ been zwagger’d out of my life, t’would not ha’ been zo long as ’tis by a vortnight. Nay, come not near the old man; keep out *che* vor’ ye, &c.—
Lear, 4. 6.

2.

—’t will be his own

And ’s masters too another day, *che* voor un.

T. of a Tub, 2. 1.

3.

You are still In-and-In—

I would be Master Constable, if *che* could win.

T. of a Tub, 2. 1.

Utchy seems to be the Old-German *ihha* or *ihcha*, ‘ I myself’ (Graff.), and is probably the same word as the Latin *ego*.

A more common form in the west of England for the first pronoun personal is *ise* or *es* (Jennings, Gloss.). The origin of this term is not a very obvious one: we might conjecture that the *c* had

become *s* before the narrow vowel, according to a well-known law of letter-change, and so we had got *ise* instead of *iche*. But the existence of the two forms in such close proximity,—*iche* or *utchy* being used in the south of Somersetshire and *ise* in all the rest of the country west of the Parret (Jennings),—may perhaps be a difficulty in the way of such a conclusion.

In the 'Exmoor Scolding,' and also in the 'Courtship,' the word *utchy* does not occur, and *ich* only in cases where it coalesces with its verb, *cham*, *chill*, *choud*, *chave*, &c.*; in most other cases we have *es*.

4. Well ont Nell, *es* hired what ya zed, and *es* thank ye too. Bet now *chave* a zeed ye, 'tez zo good as *chad* a eat ye as they uze to zey. *Es* must go home now as vast as *es* can.—The Courtship.

The 'Devonshire Dialogue,' written by Miss Reynolds (sister of Sir Joshua), shows the progress of the schoolmaster in the more general use of *I* as the first person, though we still have *es* occasionally.

5. *I've* a good doust bed-tye &c. and a banging brass kittle, that *es* may swap for what goods *es* may lack.—Dev. Dial. 3. Mrs. Gwatkin's edit.

Es seems to have been sometimes placed, by way of pleonasm, before *cham*, *chill*, *choud*, &c.

6. — nif they don't g'in by Zundey-zenneert, chell tell tha in short company *es chell* borst ma heart, &c.—The Courtship.

and it was probably from a loose recollection of this idiom that Pope got his *chez*, a word which appears to be unknown in the west of England (Jennings, p. 11). The pastoral written in ridicule of Phillips, and so cleverly smuggled into the 'Guardian,' No. 40, begins with the following lines:

7. Ah! Rager, Rager, *chez* was zore afraid
When in yond vield you kiss'd tha Passons maid, &c.

The first and second pronouns personal took a dual form in the Anglo-Saxon: *wit*, we two; *git*, ye two; *unc*, us two; *inc*, you two. These dual forms were occasionally used in the 13th century. Thus in his address to his brother, Ormin tells him,

8. *Wit* shulenn tredenn unaderfott and all thwert ut for werrpenn
The dom off all that lathe flocc, &c.
We two should tread under our foot, and out all from us cast
The notion of all that hateful crew, &c. Ormulum.

And again,

9. And *unnc* birrth bidenn God tatt he forgife hemm here sinne.
And us two befits to pray to God that he forgive their sin.

The following appears to be the type from which, in our Old-En-

* That *ch* represents *ich* and not *iche* in these cases, appears from the circumstance, that we find the phrases *icham*, *ichot*, &c., or the contracted forms *cham*, *chot*, &c., in MSS. where *ich* occurs in almost every page and *iche* is never met with.

glish dialects, the declension of the third personal pronoun more or less deviated :

	<i>Sing.</i>			<i>Plur.</i>
	M.	F.	N.	M. F. N.
N.	he	heo	hit	hi
G.	his	hire	his	hire
D.	him	hire	him	him
A.	hine	hi	hit	hi

The chief departure from this form of declension consists in the substitution of the dative for the accusative, an anomaly which is found in both numbers, and in all the genders except the neuter singular. This use of the dative is of very early date, for we meet with it in the 'Ormulum,' but it does not admit of any very obvious explanation.

The dialect now spoken in the west of England uses *en* as the objective case of *he*; and this form appears at no distant period to have been widely diffused throughout our southern counties. For reasons which may appear more clearly hereafter, it may perhaps be safer to consider *en* as a representative of the dative *him* rather than as a corruption of the old accusative *hine*.

10. — he is high Constable

And who should read above *un* or avore *hun*.

B. Jonson, T. of a Tub, 1. 2.

11. It's well vor *un*, I could not get at *un*, I'd a lick'd *un*, &c.—Tom Jones, 6. 10.

12. Zum zed a Lâyer gid *en* bad advice.

Jennings, The Churchwarden.

13. Ad; nif es come athert *en*, chell gee *en* a lick, &c.—Exmoor Courtship.

The pronouns *he* and *heo* are still carefully distinguished in some of our northern dialects.

14. Sed I, I understand yo want'n o good bandy-hewit, Sur, on I've a pure ou t'sell here. Let's see the shap on hur, sed *he*; so I stroak't hur deawn th' back on croobb'd hur oth' greawnd. *Hoo's* th' finest of ew'ry saigh sed *he*, &c.—Collier's Tim Bobbin, 5.

But in our western dialect the distinction seems to have been lost at a very early period. Even in Robert of Gloucester we sometimes have *he* written for *heo* (see p. 129. l. 8, p. 268. l. 14, &c.), and from these occasional blunders we may reasonably infer that in the *spoken* language the two forms were often confounded. *He* and *heo* were probably both of them pronounced with the sound of the short *e*, which our dramatists generally express by *a*—*quoth a*. This sound must certainly have been intended by Jennings, when he gives us *er* as used west of the Parret for *he*; and also by Spenser, when he writes *her* as a substitute for the same pronoun.

15. Hobb. Diggon Davie I bid *her* God-day
Or Diggon *her* is or I missay.

Digg. *Her* was *her* while it was day light
But now *her* is a most wretched wight. September.

Some critics have seen in these lines "a sprinkling of the Welsh dialect," while Johnson denounces them as a specimen of "studied barbarism." Their peculiarity consists chiefly in the spelling. If we write *a* for *her*, we shall have little to shock any one who is familiar with the style of our dramatists, unless it be the use of the first *her* as an objective case.

The plurals *hi*, *hire*, *hem*, were common in our literature till the 16th century; but their modern substitutes, *they*, *their*, *them*, occur so often and so early in our northern and eastern MSS., as to raise a doubt whether the former pronouns were known in the east and north of England otherwise than as portions of our *written* language.

It is difficult to illustrate the declension of the neuter pronoun, owing to the custom which prevailed in some of our Old-English dialects, of using the pronoun masculine when speaking of things inanimate. In the following examples, however, there can be little doubt that *his* represents the genitive of *it*.

16. — let men shette the dores and go thenne
Yet wol the fire as faire lie and brenne
As twenty thousand men might *it* behold—
His office natural ay wol *it* hold.

Chau. W. of Bathes Tale, 285.

17. This Apoplexy is, as I take it, a kind of lethargy—I have read the cause of *his* effects in Galen; *it* is a kind of deafness.—2 Hen. IV. 1. 2.

18. If the salt have lost *his* savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned. *It* is neither fit for the land nor yet for the dunghill, but men cast *it* out.—Luke xiv. 35.

19. Some affirm that every plant has *his* particular fly or caterpillar, which *it* breeds and feeds.—Walton's Angler, 1. 5.

20. This rule is not so general, but that *it* admitteth *his* exceptions.—Carew.

The genitive *its* is of late introduction into our language. Though used by our dramatists and many of their contemporaries, it does not occur in our versions of the Bible, the substitute being *his*, or the compound term *thereof*. As a substitute in our north-western dialects we sometimes have the unchanged pronoun *it*; and as this latter idiom has left traces behind it in our literature, it may be well to examine it with some attention.

When two substantives signifying different things come together in the same clause of a sentence, the latter substantive is said to govern the former, which is put in the genitive case. But in our Old-English dialects the first substantive often remained unchanged.

21. And þe quene also þe *kyng wyf* and opere of þulke syde.

R. Glou. 461.

22. þe bridde was from Habraham forte Moyse com
þe ferthe fro Moyse to *Dauid kyndom*.

R. Glou. 9.

23. In *Saynt Bede bokes* writen er stories olde.

R. Br. 1.

24. Northumberland was in affray for *Edred coming*.

R. Br. 34.

25. The maister went out of the toun.
And hadde mani a blessing
Of his *disciple delivering*. Seuyn Sages, 1535.
26. My farthing is in the *preest hand*.
Townl. Myst. Mact. Abel.
27. No man mai tell in bok breue
The ludy care. Octov. 534.
28. And to fulfill his *prince desire*
Sends word of all that haps in Tyre. Per. 2. 1.

In accordance with this rule, we find the pronoun *it* discharging the duties of a genitive.

29. For I will speke with the sprete
And of *hit* woe wille I wete
Gif that I may *hit* bales bete, &c.

Antur of Arthur at the Tarne-Wathelan, 8.

30. On me kawve (the dule bore eawt *it een* for me) took th' tit for *it mother* and would need seouk her, &c.—Collier's Tim Bobbin, 1.

31. Still I'd one comfort awlus popt up *it heeod*, for &c.—Ibid. 6.

32. I'm een sorry for it—munneh howd it *hecod* while it *heart* brasts o bit?—Ibid. 7.

33. A man yance steaal a horse an' murder'd it ith top a thor fells an *it spirit* hes oways haunted that spot evver sen.—Wheeler's Westmoreland Dialogues.

This idiom was not unknown to our dramatists, though, like other provincial forms of speech, generally used by them when they affected a familiar or a bantering style.

34. Do child, go to *it grandam* child,
Give grandam kingdom, and *it grandam* will
Give it a plum, a cherry and a fig—
There's a good grandam! King John, 2. 1.

35. — Your knighthood itself shall come on its knees and shall be rejected; it shall be sued for its fees to execution, and not be redeemed; it shall cheat at the twelpenny ordinary, *it knighthood* for its diet all the term-time, and tell tales for it in the vacation to the hostess; or *it knighthood* shall do worse, take sanctuary in Cole Harbour and fast. It shall fright all *it friends* with borrowing letters; and when one of the fourscore hath lent *it knighthood* ten shillings, *it knighthood* shall go to the Cranes or the Bear at the Bridge foot and be drunk in fear; &c.—B. Jons. The Silent Woman, 2. 3.

Our editors, as might be expected, carefully insert the apostrophe—*it'*.

In one case only is this idiom now admitted into our standard language : our verbal substantives in *ing* are still often preceded by an uninflected substantive, or by the pronoun *it*.

36. Though there be but one sun existing in the world, yet the idea of *it being abstracted* so that more substances might each agree with it, it is as much a sort, as if there were as many suns as there are stars.—Locke.

Our grammarians call the verbal substantive a participle when it

is preceded by an uninflected substantive or pronoun; and Priestley translates the sentence, "what is the meaning of the *lady holding up* her train," into "what is the meaning of *the lady in holding up* her train." But this is mistaken criticism. The second word is *always* a substantive, and the genitival relation exists, whether the inflexion be expressed or not. Priestley considers the use of the genitive as the more "elegant" construction, "what is the meaning of the *lady's holding up*," &c. The real question seems to be, whether it is worth while, in one particular instance, unnecessarily to retain an idiom, which in every other case has been rejected from our written language.

In the west of England, when speaking of things inanimate, they use the masculine pronoun instead of the neuter.

37. I've be to Vickrage to vet a book vor dame. The passon zeth Is may read *an*, if Is dont fouss *en*, nor make dogs ears o *an*.—Dev. Dial. 1. Balmer's edit.

38. An then ānt zed 'twer time tō goo
In huome; a-holden up her shoe
To show how wet 'e wer wi' dew.

Barnes, Dors. Dial. Uncle and Ant.

39. She had a tongue to speak, an wit
Enough to use *en* when 'twer fit.—Ibid. Shodon Fair.

This singular usage may perhaps be thus explained. By far the larger proportion of Anglo-Saxon nouns were either masculine or feminine; the former would require the pronoun *he*, the latter *heo*. These pronouns, there is reason to believe, were often confounded in our western counties as early as the 13th century, though they appear to have been for the most part distinguished, when they had to express difference of sex. Hence, in the Old-English, we had *he* substituted for a vast number of nouns, feminine as well as masculine; and, distinction of gender having been once broken in upon, the masculine inflexions seem gradually to have been substituted for the feminine. The comparatively few neuter nouns must, by degrees, have been brought under the same rule.

40. — he clepede þat toun y wys
Aftur ys name Gloucestre, as *he* ȝut y clepud ys. R. Glou. 67.

41. To þe castel of Tonebrugge by þe wey hii come
And asayled *hym* vaste ynou, and atte last *hym* nome.
R. Glou. 387.

42. Vor al þe godenesse, þat ȝoe dude her in Engeland
He mowe noȝt al be her ywrite.—R. Glou. 436.

43. The worlde as of *his* propre kinde
Was ever untrewe, and as the blinde
Improperly *he* demeth fame
He blameth that is nought to blame
And preiseth that is nought to preise. Gower, Conf. Am. f. 4.

44. So gret lyȝtynge was þe vyfte ȝer, so þat al to noȝt
þe rof þe chyrche of Salisbury yt broute
Ryȝt evene þe vyfte day þat *he* yhalwed was. R. Glou. 416.

45. Holi churchē quath Pandulf so riȝtuol is and was
That *he* ssal no prelat sette adoun, withoute apert trespas.
R. Glou. 501.
46. —we esseth and na more.
That thou suerie vpe the bok clanliche to restore
Holi churchē, that thou hast *him* binome. R. Glou. 500.
47. For euery land *him* selfe deceiveth
And of disease *his* part receiveth. Gower, Conf. Am. f. 2.
48. Engeland ys a wel god land ich wene of eche lond best,
Y set in the ende of þe world, as al in þe west,
þe see goth *him* al a boutē, *he* stont as an yle. R. Glou. 1.
49. The sward stýntet for no stuffe, *he* was so well stelet*.
Antur of Arthur at the Tarne-Wathelan, 5. 45.

Toun and *castel*, ex. 40, 41, were originally masculine nouns; *goodnesse*, *worlde* and *churchē*, ex. 42, 43, 44, feminine; and *lond*, *Engeland* and *sward* (a sword), neuter. The rule assigning the masculine pronoun to things inanimate as well as to animals of the male sex, appears to have become as general as we now find it in our western dialect, chiefly owing to the frequent use of *it* as a collective and an indeterminate pronoun. The masculine pronoun seems to have been preferred, because it defined and individualized the object.

In our eastern and northern counties, many names of inanimate objects are treated as if they were *feminine*; but the whole system of personification in our language is one of difficulty, and requires a much more careful consideration than can be given to a subject discussed thus incidentally.

In the west of England the ending *s* appears to have been sometimes given to the accusative plural of the personal pronouns. The curious forms thence resulting have not yet quite disappeared from our provincial dialects, and they well deserve the attention of the philologist. Certain of the Indo-European languages, in declining their substantives, distinguished the accusative plural from the nominative by strengthening the final syllable, while others, and those very nearly related dialects, made no distinction. The Greek substituted a long and broad vowel for the short and narrow vowel of the nominative, making, for example, *πατέρες* in the nominative and *πατέρας* in the accusative, while the Latin *patres* served for both cases. The Mæso-Gothic strengthened the accusative by means of the nunnation, writing *gasteis* (strangers) in the nominative and *gastins* in the accusative, while both nominative and accusative were represented by the Anglo-Saxon *gastas*. In accordance with this law, the Mæso-Gothic pronoun *eis* (they) makes *ins* in the accusative; and supposing these forms to have been known to our language, we might, according to analogy, expect to find an *ys* answering to the Mæso-Gothic *ins*. Now in Robert of Gloucester we have this very accusative *ys*†:—

* Example 49 is taken from one of our Northern MSS. It shows that in the 15th century the present idiom was widely diffused throughout our literature.

† In our Old English MSS. the pronoun of the third personal pronoun is very often written without an aspirate, and in Rob. of Gloucester we have *ys*, *ym*, *yre*, &c. for *his*, *him*, *hire*, &c. We still write the neuter *it* without any initial consonant.

50. Bishopes* also þat delyuered were
In honour of þilke stude, þere he ȝef *ys* þo
As of Euerwy and of Wales, &c. R. Glou. 149.
51. Me broȝte vorþ þys fury ssares, and leyde *ys* al arewe.
R. Glou. 338.
52. —therafter hii nome
The heueden of the hexte maystres, and to Antioche come
And leyde *ys* in her gynnys and in to cyte *ys* caste.
R. Glou. 402.
53. Tho caste þys gode Mold yre mantel of anon—
And wess the mysseles vet ech one, ar heo lete
And wypede *ys* nesseliche, and custe *ys* wel suete.
R. Glou. 435.

Some of the later MSS. substitute *hem* for *ys*, but in the last three examples the Cotton MS. agrees with the Harleian; so there is little doubt that this peculiar form was used by Robert of Gloucester, and not introduced into the MS. by one of his transcribers.

For the accusative plural of the second pronoun personal, the Irish frequently employ *yees*. It was, in all probability, imported into the country by the early colonists from Bristol, though it has left very few traces behind it in the dialect of the west of England.

54. —than ye may be bound over, and be vorst to g'in to Exter to Zizes; and than a mey zwear the peace of *es* you know, &c.—Exmoor Courtship, 8th edit. Exeter, 1778.

55. "Phil, hoist me up the keg to the loft," added he, running up the ladder, "and one of *yees* step up street, and give Rose Mc'Givney notice," &c.—Miss Edgeworth, Absentee, c. 11.

56. —"he 's as good as your husband now, Grace, and no man can part *yees* now," says I, putting their hands together.—Miss Edgeworth, Absentee.

57. —instead of addressing his opponent, he would turn to the company present and say, "Now I'll make *yiz* all sensible to a demonstration."—*Lover's Rory O'More*, c. 1.

In the Mæso-Gothic, the three pronouns personal have for their nominatives plural *weis*, *jus*, and *eis*; and *yees* appears to bear to *jus* the same analogy that *ys* does to *eis*. The initial consonant of *weis* also appears to be preserved in *vus*† or *uus*, which is sometimes found as an Old-English substitute for *us*.

58. þat þus wrecchedlyche nou *vus* dryfth out of oure kunde londe.
R. Glou. 252.
59. — he þat myȝtuol *ys*
Deþe after oure deserte, and pulte *vus* out ywys.
R. Glou. 253.
60. Wanne ssal vre reste come, and endynge of vre wo,
And among *vus* sykerness and pays? R. Glou. 306.

The Mæso-Gothic *weis* and *jus* are, according to a well-known

* *Bissopriches*, Cott. MS.

† In our northern dialects we have *wer* as the possessive pronoun.—See Brockett and Jamieson.

letter-change, represented by the German *wir* and *ihr*, and *weis* by the Icelandic *ver*. These pronouns are, all of them, nominatives; while our English forms *ys*, *yees* and *vus* are used only in the objective case. But in the Danish the pronoun *i* (ye) makes in the objective case *jer**, and this word *jer* enters into the very same constructions of the English *yees*.

When an emphasis is thrown on the personal pronouns, they are treated, in the west of England, as if they were indeclinable: thus a Dorsetshire man would say, "gie *me* the pick," but with an emphasis, "gie the money to *I*, not *he*."—Barnes Dissertation, p. 26. This syntax is certainly as old as the 14th century, and probably originated in the insignificance which attached to the objective pronouns, owing to their frequent use in our language as mere expletives. The idiom is well known to our literature, and one or other of its varieties may be found in almost every one of our dialects. *I*, *he* and *they* are rarely found as objective pronouns except in our southern counties, but *we* reaches as far north as the Trent, and the indeclinable *ye* may be met with in every corner of the island.

61. You know my father hath no child but *I*. As you like it, 1. 2.
62. Now Margaret's curse is fall'n upon our heads,
When she exclaimed, on Hastings you and *I*. Rich. III. 3. 3.
63. She zed whenever she shood die,
Er little crutch she'd gee ta *I*.
Jennings, Mary Ramsey's Crutch.
64. That Slender, though well landed, is an idiot,
And *he* my husband best of all affects. M. Wives of W. 4. 4.
65. —those too high aspiring, who rebell'd
With Satan, *he* who envies now thy state. Par. Lost, 6. 890.
66. No, no, it will do 'n no harm with *he*, assure yourself.—Tom Jones, 4. 10.
67. And if he deth chell ha' as good a varrant for *he*, as he can for me, don't quesson it.—Exmoor Courtship.
68. —a vetch'd out his mad upon *he*, and clapper-clawed en vinely.—Dev. Dial. 25. Gwatkin's edit.
69. I speke of us, *we* mendiants, *we* freres.
Chau. Somnoures Tale, 204.
70. Men shuld him brennen in a fire so red
If he were found, or that men might him spie—
And *we* also to bear him companie.
Chau. Second Nonnes Priest, 3386.
71. —to poor *we*,
Thine enmity's most capital. Cor. 5. 3.
72. What may this mean,
That thou, dread corse, again in complete steel
Revisit'st thus the glimpses of the moon,
Making night hideous, and *we* fools of nature
So horribly to shake our disposition? Hamlet, 1. 4.

* It may perhaps be well to observe that the genitive of this pronoun, *jeres*, must not be confounded with our doubly-inflected genitive *yours*; it appears to be formed from an obsolete nominative, *jer*, answering to the German *ihr* and the Mæso-Gothic *jus*.

The use of *ye*, as an objective case, is very common, both in our written and in our spoken language. This may have arisen, in part, from its gradual disuse as a nominative, owing to the frequent employment of *you*, the dative of the reflective pronoun. Indeed at one time the two forms *ye* and *you* seem to have been near changing places in our language, so that the object should be always represented by the former and the subject by the latter.

73. Sir, tak me thi son, he said,
And *you* sal hald *ye* ful wele payd. The Seuyne Sages, 72.
74. As I have made *ye* one Lords, one remain;
So I grow stronger, *you* more honour gain. H. VIII. 4. 2.
75. What gain *you* by forbidding it to tease *ye*,
It now can neither trouble *ye* nor please *ye*. Dryden.

They is properly a demonstrative pronoun, and in the Anglo-Saxon was thus declined: nom. *þa*; gen. *þara*; dat. *þam*; acc. *þa*. For the nominative and accusative *þa*, the Old-English substituted *po*, and in some cases *pe*. In the following examples it is not easy to say, whether *they* represents the old accusative or the indeclinable pronoun.

76. The pope of alle her sunnes asoileth alle *the*
Clerkes and lewede, that fram thi seruise wolle fle. R. Glou. 501.
77. — the soft way, which thou dost confess
Were fit for thee to use, (as *they* to claim,) Cor. 3. 2.
In asking their good loves.
78. They that trust in the Lord shall never be moved, and *they* that
abase themselves before him he will exalt.—J. Newton, Letter I. to Rev.
Mr. P.
79. — rail'd over by *they*, that dont care what lies they tell.—Dev. Dial.
14. Mrs. Gwatkin's edit.

She, like *they*, seems to have been originally a demonstrative pronoun. It is generally considered to be a corruption of the Anglo-Saxon *seo*; but the monk who added the reign of Stephen to the Laud Chronicle always writes it *scæ*. Shakespeare often treats it as indeclinable.

80. *She*, Claudio, that you wrong'd, look you restore. M. for M. 5. 1.
81. Yes, you have seen Cassio and *she* together. Othello, 4. 2.
82. Whip him were 't twenty of the greatest tributaries
That do acknowledge Cæsar, should I find them
So saucy with the hand of *she* here. An. and Cl. 3. 4.

He and *she* were formerly much used as mere nouns: "the *hes* in birds," "the *shes* of Italy," &c.: see Johns. Dict. Whether this usage contributed to establish the syntax we have been considering, or was one of the results proceeding from it, does not very clearly appear.

The word *man* was used in the Anglo-Saxon as an indeterminate and collective pronoun; and in the Old-English was sometimes em-

ployed to signify a *being* generally, as in the proverbial expression "God's a good man."—Much Ado about Nothing, 3. 5. In our western dialects it takes a wider range of meaning, and is used as an equivalent for the pronoun of the third person plural, even when the reference is to things inanimate. There are parts of Devonshire in which the pronoun *them* is never heard in the language of the people, *mun*, or as it is more generally pronounced *min**, being always the substitute.

83. Her|came from a good havage—the very daps of her mother—tae *mun* every way, I dont think they have their peer.—Miss Reynolds' Dev. Dial. 7. Palmer's edit. †

84. I longed to het *men* a good slat on the chucks. Ib. 9.

85. Tha dest net caree to zey thy praers—and nif by gurt hap tha dest zey *mun* at oll, thy marrabones shan't kneelee.—Exmoor Scolding.

86. T'es wor twenty nobles a year, and a puss to put *min* in.—Exmoor Courtship.

One of the difficulties which surround the present inquiry arises from the circumstance, that in certain English dialects some of the pronouns appear to have taken *m* or *n* as a nominative ending. To illustrate this peculiarity, it will be necessary to notice the pronominal forms which prevail in other Gothic languages.

In the Swedish, Danish, Friesish and Dutch, the interrogative pronoun answering to our English *who*? is thus declined:

	Swed.	Dan.	Fries.	Dutch.
<i>Nom.</i>	hvem	hvem	wae	wie
<i>Gen.</i>	hvems		waems	wiens
<i>Obj.</i>	hvem	hvem	waem ‡	wien

the demonstrative pronoun answering to our *that*, as follows:

<i>Nom.</i>	den	den	dy	die
<i>Gen.</i>	dens	dens		diens
<i>Obj.</i>	den	den		dien

and the third pronoun personal takes, in the masculine gender, endings not altogether dissimilar:

<i>Nom.</i>	han	han	hy	hy
<i>Gen.</i>	hans	hans		
<i>Dat.</i>	honum	ham	him	hem

We observe that neither the Swedish nor the Danish distinguishes between the nominative and the objective cases of *hvem* and *den*; and although the Dutch rejects the nasal in the nominative, yet the genitives *wiens*, *diens*, seem formed on obsolete nominatives, which corresponded with the objective cases. In the Danish we have a distinction between *han* and *ham*, but we may perhaps doubt if it be

* This word *min* is merely a corruption of *man*, like the Dutch *men*; it must not be confounded with the plural noun *men*. It is often used in addressing an individual, "I'll do it *min*."—Jennings, Gloss.

† Mrs. Gwatkin, in her edition of the Dev. Dial., gives us '*em* instead of *min*.

‡ See Epkema's Grammar.

an essential one, when we see the Dutch *wiens*, *wien*, answering to the Friesish *waems*, *waem*.

Assuming the identity of the pronoun in the two cases, how do we account for it? Must we suppose that in the Northern languages, as in our own, the dative has gradually encroached upon the nominative, and that the Swedish *hvem* has become both a nominative and an objective case, in the same way as our English *you*? The following considerations appear to be strong against such a hypothesis. The peculiar form of the genitive seems to point out the nasal as an original part of the nominative; we find the demonstrative and personal pronouns represented by *thæn* and *han* in the *oldest* works of the Danish language (see Petersen's Hist.); and lastly, we have *hann* in the oldest MSS. of the Icelandic for the third pronoun personal.

If *hvem*, *den*, *han*, be real nominatives, in what language do we find their correlatives? Perhaps we may consider *hvem* as representing the Sanscrit *kim*, who? or what? *Kim* is the crude form* of the interrogative pronoun, and also, like *hvem*, is used both in the nominative and in the accusative, though only in the neuter gender,—a restriction which will hardly be considered of much consequence, when we find all the three genders represented by our neuter pronouns *it* and *that*. In like manner *idam*, the crude form of the Sanscrit demonstrative answering to our *this* or *that* (Wils. Sanscr. Gr.), may perhaps furnish us with a form analogous to *den*, for it seems to be agreed that this word is a compound *i-dam*†, and that the latter element is connected with the common form of the demonstrative pronoun, which is met with in all the Indo-European languages.

If the Swedish *hvem*, *den*, represent the Sanscrit *kim* and *i-dam*, the objective pronouns, Swedish *hvem* and English *whom*, may be different words. *Whom* seems clearly to be the Anglo-Saxon dative *hwam*; and if philologists be right in considering the Anglo-Saxon *hwam* as the same word with the Mæso-Gothic dative *hwamma*, and the Old-German *huemu*, *whom* must represent the Sanscrit dative *kasmai*, for the letter-changes which connect *kasmai* with *hwamma* will, it is presumed, be generally admitted. But is it quite certain that the Anglo-Saxon *hwam* and Mæso-Gothic *hwamma* are the same word? Notwithstanding the close and seemingly stringent analogy which supports their identity, a cautious philologist may hesitate, when he finds it requires the rejection of an important final vowel at so early a period of our language.

* In Sanscrit each substantive has its "crude form," from which the nominative and other cases are derived, according to certain laws. The crude form may be considered as the real noun, and the nominative and other cases as the forms which the noun assumes in construction. The interrogative and demonstrative pronouns have strictly no crude forms now existing, but have had *kim* and *idam* assigned to them, on the same principle that the Latin grammarians call *fero* the present tense of *tuli*—because the scheme of declension would seem incomplete if the crude form were not represented. *Kim* and *idam*, however, are real and genuine words, and not, like some tenses of certain Greek verbs, the mere invention of grammarians, for they are both actual'y used in construction as neuter pronouns.

† Bopp refers us to the Latin *i-dem* and *qui-dam*. Vergl. Gr., p. 500.

As *kasmai* represents the Mæso-Gothic dative *hwamma*, so *asmai*, the dative of the Sanscrit demonstrative, may perhaps represent *imma*, the Mæso-Gothic dative of the third pronoun personal. In this case, if *imma* be represented by our English objective *him*, we must, on the foregoing hypothesis, consider the objective pronouns, Swedish *han*, English *him*, as different words.

These speculations, uncertain and hazardous though they be, will not be thrown away, if they lend any countenance to the following inference,—that there were in the earliest period certain Gothic pronouns ending in one of the nasals, which were used both in the nominative and in the objective case, and which were *ab origine* distinct from the Gothic form representing the Sanscrit dative. We may not be able to distinguish clearly between the two forms, even in the older dialects of the Gothic, and our difficulties may increase tenfold as we approach the chaos of our modern syntax; but the distinction seems a necessary one, whether we look to the etymology of these languages or to their laws of grammatical construction. We proceed to show that the discussion which has caused the present digression is not irrelevant to the subject of this paper.

There can be little doubt that the interrogative *hvem* was used in some of our northern dialects.

87. — Sir by my lewte I the pay (pray)
The sertan soth that thou me say
Wheym is this faire lady
That thou has set at met me by? Seuyn Sages, 3271.

88. And he axed hem and seide, *whom* seien the puple that I am? Thei answerden and seiden, Ion baptist, &c., and he seide to hem, But *whom* seien 3e that I am?—Wiclif, Luk 9.

89. Tell me in sadness *whom* she is you love.
Rom. and Jul. 1. 1.

The Danish *hvem* is a relative as well as an interrogative pronoun (Rask, Dan. Gr. sect. 23); and perhaps such is the character we should assign to *whom* in the last example. The syntax employed by Wiclif in Ex. 88 was adopted both in the English translation of the Scriptures published at Geneva, and also in our present authorized version.

The Danish *hvem* sometimes fills the place of a plural relative (Rask, Gr. sect. 23); the Old-English demonstrative *then* or *them* is sometimes used for the same purpose.

90. — me and other halewen þat in þys lond were y bore
þan vor you biddeþ God, wanne we beþ hym byuore.
R. Glou. 265.

91. Alfred and Edward, *tham* of Eilred kam,
Wer with Duke Roberd. R. Br. 52.

Tham was also used as a demonstrative, both in the nominative and the objective case, and both absolutely and as an adjectival pronoun.

92. Therfor vnto þam tuo he gaf Griffyn feeze. R. Br. 63.
u 2

93. And balder than *thame* bath the fers Achill.

G. Dougl. En. 1. 7.

94. I hope then the agent will give you encouragement about *them* mines, that we may keep you among us.—Miss Edgeworth, Absentee, 12.

95. *Them** are the women I meant.

Forby, 121.

Layamon has *pan* for his dative and *pene* for his accusative; but later writers used *then*† as a mere objective case.

96. þe Cristyne men dolue vaste, and þen wal velde adoun.

R. Glou. 395.

97. And byseged þen castel syx wouke wel vaste.

R. Glou. 387.

98. Hii greþed hem, and þen way to Antioche nome.

R. Glou. 395.

99. And þe sone ȝut, þey he were ssrewe þen fader wel understod.

R. Glou. 383.

100. And say that he shal fonde
Then deth of myne honde.

Gesta of Kyng Horn, 158.

Sometimes, however, we find *then* as a nominative.

101. þer was aslawe þen hende kynȝt, þe noble Syre Waweyn.

R. Glou. 221.

It is probable that an English pronoun *him* once existed answering to the Danish and Swedish *han*, and ranging with the nominatives *them*, *whom*; and that the confusion which arose on the mixture of our dialects between these nominatives and the objective pronouns *him*, *them*, *whom*, gradually swept the former from our language. Many an obsolete term, however, has been preserved in constructions where it seemed to be countenanced by some still-existing law, under which it could not be legitimately brought; and we often find *him*, *whom*, &c. preceding a verb, as if they were its object, while in fact they are the subject of some other verb that follows in the sentence.

102. — *him I accuse*

The city-gates by this hath entered.

Cor. 5. 5.

103. Better leave undone, than by our deeds acquire

Too high a fame, when *him we serve* 's away. A. & Cl. 3. 1.

104. And as John fulfilled his course, he said, *Whom think ye that I am?*—Acts 13. 25.

105. He *whom ye pretend* reigns in heaven is so far from protecting the miserable sons of men that, &c.—Adventurer, 27.

106. If you were here, you would find two or three *whom you would say* passed their time agreeably, &c.—Locke's Letter to Molyneux.

107. The Douglas has left Perth to march against the Southron, *whom men say*† are called into the Marches by the false Earl of March.—W. Scott, Fair Maid of Perth.

* In this case it may be doubted whether *them* is not the dative of the reflective pronoun.

† Rob. of Glou. sometimes uses *wan* as the objective case, of *who*.

Uter þe gode kynge, of *wan* we speke by vore.

R. Gl. 165.

Arture Uter sone of *wan* we tolde by uore.

R. Gl. 166.

‡ These phrases might have been explained on the supposition of *whom* being a dative, but Wiclif's use of a similar construction, ex. 88, is strong against such a hypothesis.

These pronouns appear also to have kept their place in our language, when they followed the conjunctions *than* and *as*.

108. Abdiel, *than whom* none with more zeal adored
The Deity, and divine commands obey'd,
Stood up. Par. Lost, 5. 803.

109. King Charles and more *than him*, the duke and the Popish faction, were at liberty to form new schemes.—Bolingbroke.

These idioms are met with as early as the fifteenth century, see ex. 93; and they appear to have given birth to a false analogy which a century or two later overspread the language. We constantly meet with the phrases *than me*, *than her*, *than us*, *as me*, *as her*, &c., in constructions, where the ordinary rules of grammar require the pronoun to be in the nominative. Lowth, Priestley and others have collected examples of this syntax; and it was used without scruple by all the writers of Queen Anne's reign—Swift, Addison, Bolingbroke, Atterbury, &c.

Another anomalous construction is the union of *I* with the objective pronouns *thee* and *you*. The frequent use of the latter as substitutes for their respective nominatives appears to have led to this syntax, though the phrase is used indifferently as object or as subject.

110. For ever in this humble cell
Let *thee and I* for ever dwell. Prior.

111. What have two such old weather-beaten fellows as *thee and I* are to do with fortune?—Cumberland, *The Brothers*, 1. 9.

112. Now by my honest word, thou shalt help him with liquor from that cup and flagon, if *thee and I* are to bide under one roof.—W. Scott, *Fair Maid of Perth*.

113. Since there's no reserve between *you and I* now, my lord Colambre, said Sir Terence, I must tell you all, &c.—Absentee, 13.

The remaining observations might perhaps have appeared more conveniently in a former paper*, but they bear very closely upon the present subject, which would to a certain extent be incomplete without them.

The custom of adding a dative of the reflective pronoun to certain verbs appears to have prevailed chiefly in our southern dialects; another idiom which subjoined the dative of a pronoun to the verb substantive may perhaps be considered as of northern origin. It is found in the Danish *det er mig*, it is me; *var det dig*, was it thee? (Molb. Dict. *det*); *det er dem*, it is them (Molb. Dict. *den*). The phrase "it is me," may be analysed thus: *as to me—it is*; and "thou art him" thus: *as to him—thou art*. In the former case the assertion is made with, and in the latter without, the pronoun indeterminate; and both these idioms are well known to our language: see No. 19. p. 220. The following examples may be ranged under this law:—

114. I am appointed *him* to murder you. Winter's Tale, 1. 2.
115. Art thou proud yet? aye, that I am not *thee*. T. of A. 4. 3.

* No. 22. On the use of the dative in English syntax.

116. Time was when none would cry that oaf was *me*.

Dryd. Prol.

Another idiom, which may be traced to the Anglo-Saxon, and which still very frequently affects the form of our pronouns, is that of the dative absolute.

117. — the two kings

Equal in lustre were now best, now worst,
As presence did present them—*him* in eye
Still *him* in praise—and being present both—
'Twas said they saw but one.

H. VIII. 1. 1.

118. — in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us, *you also helping* together by prayer for us.—2 Cor. 1. 11.

119. — only in destroying I find ease

To my relentless thoughts, and *him destroyed*,
Or won to what may work his utter loss
For whom all this was made, all this will soon
Follow.

P. L. 9. 130.

120. Solomon made as wise proverbs as any one has done, *him only excepted*, who was a much wiser man than Solomon.—Tillotson.

121. — we must quit and give up this little snug place and house and farm and all to the agent, which would be hard on us and *me a widow*, when my husband did all that is done to the land.—The Absentee, 11.

Instead of this dative absolute, modern English writers generally give us the pronoun in the nominative. Bentley, in his edition of the 'Paradise Lost,' corrects this syntax whenever he meets with it; for *I extinct*, 9. 629; *thou looking on*, 9. 312; *thou leading*, 10. 267; *he not found*, 10. 1001, &c.; he reads, *me extinct*, *thee looking on*, *thee leading*, *him not found*, &c. His criticism was no doubt suggested by the laws of Latin grammar, but he would not have ventured upon it, had it not been borne out by contemporary English usage. The use indeed of the nominative, in these cases, does not admit of easy explanation. It is unknown to the older and purer dialects of our language, and probably originated in the use of the indeclinable pronoun, with which Milton was certainly acquainted: see ex. 65. The *you* in ex. 118 has been changed in the later editions of our Bible into *ye*. These petty corrections have been frequent during the last fifty or sixty years, and sometimes, as in the present case, have not improved the grammar of our authorized version.

INDEX TO VOL. I.

ANGLO-SAXON Gentile nouns, how declined, 103.

Arsis in the Greek Senarius probably the same thing as our English accent, 129.

Augment in Greek and Sanscrit a distinct element, 265 ; theories of Buttman, Bopp and Pott, 266 ; *a* (with) used in Welsh and sometimes in Irish as the sign of the preterite, 267 ; Irish *do* (to), and in ancient times *no* (then) and *do no* (then) employed for the same purpose, *ib.* ; Irish *ro*, answering to the Welsh *rhy*, so used, *ib.* ; in the older dialects of the German *tho* and *ther* were joined to the past tense, 268 ; addition of a preposition makes the Slavish "imperfective" verb "perfective," *ib.* ; system of verbal preformatives in the Coptic, South-Indian and Polynesian languages, 269 ; the Gothic prefix *ge*, 271 ; Greek and Sanscrit augment is probably the Welsh *a*, *ib.*

Aurelius Ambrosius the same person as the Anglo-Saxon Natanleod, 11.

Berber language :—consonants nearly identical with those of the Arabic, 136 ; two consonants rarely if ever come together in the same word except as finals, 137 ; consonants never doubled, 138 ; vowel system, *ib.* ; the roots and their inflexions, *ib.* ; letters servile and non-servile, robust and weak, *ib.* ; constitution of syllables, 139 ; roots generally biliteral, *ib.* ; structure of verbs, *ib.* ; four uncompounded tenses, 140 ; a verbal form answering to the "syncopated subjunctive" of De Sacy, *ib.* ; derivative verbs answering to the Niphal, Hiphil, &c. of the Hebrew, *ib.* ; participle ending in *an* or *ant*, 141 ; pronouns and personal endings of the verb, *ib.* ; pronouns both prefixed and suffixed to the verbal root, 142 ; relatives, *ib.* ; *t* or *th* the feminine ending, *ib.* ; sometimes a prefix, *ib.* ; genitival relation, how expressed, 143 ; words apparently Shemitic more Hebrew than Arabic, *ib.* ; numerals unlike those of the Shemitic languages, 144.

Bopp, his Sanscrit grammar, 26 ; his views as to the personal endings of the Sanscrit verb, 29 ; his theory of the Greek augment, 266.

Cæsura of the Greek Senarius considered, 129 ; **Arsis** the same thing as the English accent, *ib.* ; may fall on either syllable of the first and second foot of the Tragic Senarius, 130 ; must fall on the last syllable of the third foot, *ib.* ; Greek words very rarely accented on the last syllable, 131 ; hence the sixth syllable is almost always followed by other syllables in the same word, *ib.* ; various arrangement of the syllables, 132 ; author's conclusions, 133.

Carey (P. S.) on the origin of the phrase "Wager of Law," 57.

Celtic languages belong to the Indo-European family, 91 ; the Celtic of Gaul not Gaelic, 92 ; the Gaulish words *petorritum*, *pempedula*, *candetum*, *epona*, *eporedices* admit of satisfactory Welsh etymologies, 93 ; *velarus*, *carbidosupon*, *beliocanda*, considered, *ib.* ; modern French words more Welsh than Gaelic, *ib.* ; the Gaulish inscription *Tarvos Trigaranos*, 94 ; the Celtic of South Britain related to the Welsh, 95 ; the curious Mæso-Gothic phrases *idreigon* (to repent) and *aibr* (an offering) possibly of Celtic origin, *ib.* ; the Welsh has little Teutonic admixture and therefore was not the language of the Belgæ, 96 ; the Irish has many elements not to be met with in the Welsh and Breton, 124 ; some of these are found in the Romance, Slavish and Finnish languages, *ib.* ; many in the German dialects, 125 ; instances, *ib.* ; the substantival ending *neas*, 126.

The Celts entered Europe from the Euxine, 144 ; this appears partly from

history, partly from the Celtic elements to be met with in the languages of the neighbouring races, *ib.*; instances from the Armenian and Slavish languages, 145; the Slavish *bolvan* apparently the Celtic *peulvan*, 148; instances from the Albanian, *ib.*

In what manner have the Celtic dialects influenced the current language of England? 169; terms relating to agriculture, masonry, &c. which seem to be borrowed from the Celtic dialects of Great Britain, 171; Mæso-Gothic words answering to Welsh words beginning with *gw* or *cw*, 177; Anglo-Saxon words of the same class, 178; the Welsh initial *chw* generally answers to the German and Sanscrit initial *sw*, 179; examples, *ib.*

A word found in our own or any other language may be shown to be Celtic by its etymology or its intrinsic meaning, 243; instances, 244; or by exhibiting forms peculiar to the Celtic, *ib.*; derivatives formed by prefixing a consonant, 246; the Welsh prefix *ys*, 247; Gaelic prefix *s*, *ib.*; Anglo-Saxon prefix *s*, 248; the Welsh initial *s* answering to *st* in other languages, 249.

Chinese roots, number of compounds into which each root enters, 60; whole number of compounds 11,600, 62; of which number 8200 are comprised under thirty-three roots, signifying respectively *man, woman, body, mouth, heart, hand, disease, eye, flesh, foot, dog, horse, insect, fish, bird, tree, grain, bamboo, grass, gem, metals, earth, hill, sun, water, fire, mound, knife, silk, garment, wheat, speak, walk safely, ib.*; and under the seven roots, *man, mouth, heart, hand, tree, grass, water*, are comprised no less than 3385 compounds, 63.

Cimbri always placed by the ancients at the extreme limit of the area geographically known to them, 181; Cimbri and Teutones probably kindred races, 184; testimonies in favour of the German origin of the Cimbri, Teutones and Ambrones, *ib.*; in favour of their Gaulish descent, 187; the latter preponderate, 189; the Cimbri called the Northern Ocean *Morimarus* or Dead Sea, *ib.*; this word may be Celtic or Slavonic, 190; similarity between the languages of the Celts and Æstii, 191; author's conclusions, *ib.*

Cockayne (Rev. O.) on the construction of ἵνα, ὅπως, ὥς with the past indicative, 227; on the Lydian dynasty which preceded the Mermnadæ, 274.

Daniell (Rev. E. T.) his collection of Lycian inscriptions, 193.

Davis (J. F.) on the classification of the Chinese roots, 58.

Derivatives of the Welsh word *gwy*, 65.

Donaldson (Rev. J. W.) on Plato's number, 81; on Herodotus and the Athenians, 161.

Ellipsis of the English pronoun personal before the second person singular of the verb, 218; when two clauses are brought together without a conjunction, or with a conjunction *continuative*, 215; when the pronouns expressed and omitted require different cases, 219; ellipsis of the objective pronoun, 220; of the pronoun indeterminate, *ib.*; of the pronoun relative, 221.

English language, how far influenced by the Celtic dialects of Great Britain, 169.

Substantives plural in *ren*, 115; collective substantive in *y*, in *ry*, 116; gentile nouns in *e*, 102; in *es*, 108; in *en*, 109; in *ishe*, 110; in *reis*, 113; in *ry*, 117; names of districts in *e*, 104; in *es*, 107; in *en* or *on*, 110; in *ske*, 111; in *ye*, *ib.*; in *res*, 114; in *ry*, 117; in *ings*, *ib.*; in *folk*, 118.

The indefinite declension of the adjective, 66; the genitive plural in *er*, 67; in *ers*, *ib.*; plural inflexion *e*, 70; the definite declension, 72; the same as the *n* declension of the substantive, 73; *en* sometimes a nominative ending, *ib.*; the phrases *himselfen, themselves, &c.*, 74; *es* an inflexion of the plural adjective, 75; of the plural relative, 76.

Pronouns personal, 277; various forms of the first pronoun personal, *I, ich, iche, 'che, ib.*; dual forms, *wit, git, unc, inc*, 278; *hun*, objective case of *he*, 279; *his*, genitive of *it*, 280; *it* used as a genitive case, 281; the masculine pronoun used when speaking of things inanimate, 282; *vus, yees, ys*, objective cases plural of the three pronouns personal, 284; the emphatic or indeclina-

ble pronoun, 285 ; *I, he, we*, used as objective pronouns, 285, 292 ; *ye, they, she*, used as objective pronouns, 286 ; *mun* or *min* used as the objective case plural of the third pronoun personal, 286 ; pronouns which take a nasal as their nominative ending, 287 ; *weym* or *whom* used as a nominative, 289, 290 ; *þan* and *þam* used as nominatives, 289 ; *him* apparently used as a nominative, 290.

The genitives plural *our, your, &c.*, 67 ; the doubly inflected genitives *ours, yours, &c, ib.* ; the doubly inflected genitives *hiss'n, our'n, &c.*, 70.

Orthography :—the present mode of spelling the passive participle erroneous, 7 ; the old spelling accommodated to the pronunciation and more correct, *ib.* ; means for expressing each elementary sound of our language by a distinct character, 215.

English syntax :—a substantive often qualified by a succeeding substantive, 75, 263 ; both substantives put in the plural number, 76 ; use of the dative with the sense of *unto*, 252 ; with the sense of *from, ib.* ; dative generally follows the verb and precedes the accusative, *ib.* ; different order in the Old-English, 253 ; use of dative as an instrumental case, *ib.* ; to express relation, 254 ; use of the dative with the verb substantive and with the verbs *to come, to fall, to hap, &c.*, 255 ; in the phrases *him adde betere, we rather had, &c.*, 256 ; use of the dative as a substitute for the genitive, *ib.* ; *we usself*, 263 ; to denote the person to whom some advantage accrues, 257 ; the *dativus ethicus, ib.* ; dative of the reflexive pronoun, 258, 259 ; when this dative is used, the nominative is often omitted, 260 ; this dative often treated as a substitute for the nominative, *ib.* ; use of the dative in such phrases as *it is me*, 191 ; the dative absolute, 192.

The doubly inflected forms, *ours, yours, &c., our'n, your'n, &c.*, only used absolutely, 68 ; *our, your, &c.* sometimes used absolutely, *ib.* ; the phrases *her eyder, your noither, &c.*, 69.

The adjectives during the Old-English period agreed in number with their substantives, 70, 74 ; under what circumstances they took their definite form, 72 ; the adjective *self* very generally took its definite form *selve*, 261 ; *self* and *selve* always follow the dative of the reflexive pronoun, *me self, him self, &c., ib.* ; the neuter adjective often treated as a substantive *mi self, &c., ib.* ; the forms *himselven, myselven, &c.*, 74, 261 ; the adjective *one* also follows the dative of the reflexive pronoun *him one, &c.*, 262 ; the neuter adjective often treated as a substantive *his one, &c., ib.* ; the compound *alone* or *'lone* enters into the same constructions, *him alone, your alone, &c., ib.* ; the syntax *wesylf, ussylv, &c.*, 263 ; *we ussylv, they themself, ib.* ; *themselves, ourselves, &c.*, 264 ; use of the genitive *ones, hire anes muð, &c., ib.*

Use of the indeterminate pronoun *me*, 151 ; the indeterminate pronoun *it* with a plural signification, 153 ; used for all the genders, *ib.* ; the phrases *it rains, it hails, &c.*, 156 ; *it* used as predicate, *it am I, &c., ib.* ; indeterminate pronoun *the* or *ta*, 158 ; the adverbs *the-furth, the-but, &c., ib.* ; indeterminate pronoun *that* as subject, *ib.* ; as predicate, *ib.* ; indeterminate pronoun *there* as subject, *ib.* ; as predicate, *ib.* ; adverbs *thereto, hereto, &c.*, 160.

Etymology of the words *trap-rock*, 12 ; *summer*, 92 ; *funnel*, 243 ; *cobble, ib.* ; *bride, ib.* ; *haven*, 244 ; of the names of places : *Orkney*, 9 ; *Ramsgate, Kent, Canterbury, Winchester, Worcester*, 10 ; *Netley, Ambresbury, Charford*, 11 ; *Bakewell*, 113 ; *Manchester, ib.* ; *Hastings*, 117 ; *Surrey, Normandy*, 111 ; *Norfolk, Suffolk*, 118 ; *Wight*, 65 ; of the gentile nouns : *Engle*, 106 ; *Londreis, Surreis, Norreis*, 114 ; *Manx*, 113 ; of the Romance names : *Londres*, 115 ; *Flandres*, 116 ; of the Welsh names of districts : *Ruim, Andred, Gwent*, 10 ; *Brynaic*, 12 ; of the Latin : *Orca-des*, 9 ; *Huicci, Cantuarensis, Wintonensis*, 10 ; *Vectis*, 65.

Fry (D.) on the reformation of English orthography, 215.

Garnett (Rev. R.) on the language and dialects of the British Islands, 21 ; same subject continued, 144, 169, 263 ; on the probable relations of the Picts and Gael with the other tribes of Great Britain, 119 ; on the origin and import of the augment in Sanscrit and Greek, 265.

Gentile nouns used as names of districts, 103.

Greek language. See Augment, Cæsura, Herodotus, Plato:—Greek inscription found in Corfu, 149; apparently as old as the time of Pisistratus, 150; contains the three characters Θ Ξ Φ, *ib.*; read *throughout* from right to left, *ib.*; Οἰανθός treated as a trisyllable, *ib.*; πρόξενος for πρόξενος, *ib.*; ι in Τλασίας made long, *ib.*; κονίθη for ἐκονήσατο, *ib.*

On the construction of ἴνα, ὅπως, ὥς with the past indicative, 227; Dr. Monk's interpretation of this syntax, *ib.*; another proposed, 228; various examples in which this syntax occurs, 230.

Gryech, his arrangement of the Russian verbs, 97.

Grotefend, his criticisms on the Lycian inscriptions considered, 194, 201.

Guest (E.) on certain Welsh names of places preserved in English compounds, 9; on certain inflexions of the Old-English adjective, 65; on English gentile nouns, and more particularly on their secondary use as names of places, 103; on English pronouns indeterminate, 161; on the ellipsis and on the pleonastic use of the pronoun personal in English syntax, 217; on the use of the dative in English syntax, 251; on English pronouns personal, 277.

Hawtrey (Rev. Dr.) on a Greek inscription lately found in Corfu, 149.

Herodotus:—in the year B.C. 440 Herodotus must have been at Athens or Samos, 161; was in Athens after the year B.C. 437, 162; joined the great Grecian settlement at Thurii, *ib.*; probably became μέτοικος of Athens after the siege of Samos, and as such μέτοικος went to Thurii, 162; was well acquainted with the works of Sophocles, 163; passage in the Antigone imitated, 164; the saying of Solon perhaps taken from the CEd. Tyrannus, *ib.*; other imitations of Sophocles, 165; Lysias and Xenophon imitators of Herodotus, *ib.*; Herodotus seems to have arranged and in part compiled his history at Thurii, 166; more especially for Athenians and from Athenian authorities, *ib.*

The passage 1. vii. παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκδεκόμενος τὴν ἀρχὴν considered, 275.

Irish language. See Celtic languages.

Latham (R. G.) on the languages of the Papuan or Nègrito race scattered through the Australian and other Asiatic islands, 37; on the doctrine of the Cæsura in the Greek Senarius, 129; on the evidence of a connection between the Cimbri and the Chersonesus Cimbrica, 181; on the reciprocal pronouns and on the reciprocal power of the reflective verb, 232.

Lhuyd (Edw.), the first to point out the affinity between the Celtic dialects and other languages of the Indo-European family, 92.

Lycian inscriptions, how decyphered, 193; the vowels, 194; the alphabet generally, 196; bilingual inscription (Lycian and Greek) at Limyra, 197; at Levis, *ib.*; at Antiphellus, 200; at Tlos, 203; Lycian inscription at Koorostan, *ib.*; at Gandyva, *ib.*; at Limyra, 204; on the Sarcophagus-tomb at Xanthus, 205; at Armostel near Limyra, *ib.*; second inscription at Gandyva, 206; inscription near Limyra, *ib.*; at Myra, 207; at Antiphellus, 208; two inscriptions near Armostel, 209; inscription at Xanthus, *ib.*; near Cadyanda, *ib.*; two other inscriptions at Limyra, 210; inscriptions near Armostel, 211; at Sura, *ib.*; at Cyane, 213; at Rhodiopolis, *ib.*; at Antiphellus and at Limyra, 214; at Tlos, 215.

Lydian dynasty of the Mermnadæ not fabulous, 275; probably an Assyrian race, 276.

Magyar the, of Median descent, 127; under what names known to the later Greeks, 118; many Persian terms significant in Magyar, 128; many names of places found both in Persia and Hungary, *ib.*

Members, original, 1; elected during the first session, 37, 57, 77, 91, 119, 127; during the second session, 149, 161, 193, 243, 265.

Natanleod, meaning of this Anglo-Saxon compound, 11.

Negrito languages, term defined, 37; spoken in the Andaman, Nicobar and Car-nicobar islands, and in Malacca, *ib.*; in Sumatra, Orang Cooboo, Orang Googoo, Borneo, the Sooloo islands, and the Manillas, 38; in Formosa, the Loochoo islands, Java, Savoo, Timor, Ombay, 39; in Celebes, Bourou, Gilolo, the Teetees, Oby and New Guinea, 40; in Waigioo, Guebé, 41; in the Fiji islands, New Ireland, Manicolo, Mallicollo, Tanna, New Caledonia and Australia, 42; in Van Diemen's Land and New Guinea, 43; vocabularies of New Guinea compared with each other, 44; of New Ireland, 45; of Australia, 46; of Van Diemen's Land, 48; vocabularies of *different* islands compared with each other, *ib.*; of Andaman and Samang, of New Guinea and Waigioo, *ib.*; of New Guinea and New Ireland, 49; of Port Praslin and Carteret Bay, *ib.*; of New Ireland and Manicolo, of Manicolo and Mallicollo, of Mallicollo and Tanna, of the last two and New Caledonia, 50; of Port Dalrymple and King George's Sound, of Port Dalrymple and Gulf St. Vincent, of Port Dalrymple and Jervis's Bay, 51; the vocabularies of *distant* districts compared with each other, 52; author's conclusions, 54.

Newman (F. W.) on Scythia and the surrounding countries according to Herodotus, 77; on the Berber language of Mount Atlas, generally supposed to be that of the ancient Mauritians, 135.

Old-English, how distinguished from the Anglo-Saxon and modern English, 65.

Picts not a Teutonic but a Celtic race, 120; nearly allied to the Welsh, *ib.*; names of Pictish kings, *ib.*; the Pictish term *peann fahel* considered, 121; St. Columba preached to the Picts through an interpreter, *ib.*; names of places in the Pictish territory Welsh, 122, 123; the Picts of Galloway, 123.

Plato, the passage in the Republic relating to the celebrated Number considered, 81; the number appears to be the cube of 6 or 216, 85; Plato seems to have looked upon numbers as types of the fixed and invariable, 88; assumes in the Republic that there are four cardinal virtues, three parts of the human soul and five kinds of government, *ib.*; his reasons for introducing the present intricate-calculation, 89; like fanciful speculations in his other writings, 90.

Pleonastic use of the English pronoun personal before a proper name, 221; the pronoun precedes the verb and the proper name follows it, 222; cases in which the pleonastic pronoun *follows* the substantive with which it is in apposition, *ib.*; the pronoun in the genitive, *the knight his manhood*, &c., 223; both substantive and pronoun in the same case, 224; a preposition before the substantive, "of the king his eldest sonne," *ib.*; pleonastic use of the pronoun personal when coupled with the relative, *ib.*; the pronoun the object of the verb, 225; the relative and the personal pronoun in the same case, *ib.*; relative in one clause of a sentence and pronoun personal in the other, 226; such phrases as *conceal me what I am*, &c., *ib.*

Reciprocal or mutual action, how expressed in different languages, 233; by means of the adverb, *ib.*; of two nouns or pronouns, separate or compounded, 234; by using a reciprocal form of the verb, 235; deponent verb, 236; in Icelandic the middle verb is the active verb with a reflective pronoun, *ib.*; sometimes took a reciprocal meaning, 237; French reflective verbs with reciprocal power, 241; reciprocal power of the Greek middle verb, *ib.*

Rosen's work on the Sanscrit roots, 33.

Russian verbs, how arranged by Gryech and by Schmidt, 97; personal endings, 98; formation of the preterite, present of the imperative and perfect of the imperative, 101; Russian verbs corresponding to those of the several Sanscrit conjugations, 99; semel-factive verbs, 101; iterative verbs, *ib.*

Russian vowels, how changed before certain gutturals, 99; before certain palatals, *ib.*

Sanscrit augment. See Augment.

Sanscrit grammars and dictionaries compiled by Europeans, 13; no prejudice in the Brahmins against imparting a knowledge of the Sanscrit language, 14;

Shelkh Felzi, 15.; the Jesuit mission at Madura, *ib.*; the Vyácarana of Paulinus a Bartholomæo, 16; Hanxleden, 16; college of Fort William founded, 17; Carey's grammar, *ib.*; Colebrooke's grammar, 18; Forster's grammar, 20; Yates's grammar, 21; Asiatic Society of Calcutta, *ib.*; Sir W. Jones, *ib.*; works of English scholars worked their way slowly on the continent, 22; Professor Chezy, *ib.*; Wilkins's grammar, *ib.*; grammars published on the continent, 25; Frank's grammar, *ib.*; Bopp's grammar, 26; his views with respect to the personal endings, 29; with respect to derivation, 32; the author's own grammar, *ib.*; lists of Sanscrit radicals given by Carey, and more partially by Wilkins and Forster, 33; Rosen's work on the Sanscrit roots, *ib.*; Westergaard's, *ib.*; papers relating to the Sanscrit language in various literary periodicals, 34; the Amara Kosha translated, 35; author's own dictionary, 36; glossaries added to Bopp's edition of Nalus and Johnson's edition of certain parts of the Hitopadesa, Mahabharata and Megha Dúta, 36.

Sanskrit second preterite ed'ām-āsa, its probable origin, 274.

Schmidt, his arrangement of the Russian verbs, 97.

Scythia:—nations bordering on Scythia, 77; notions of Herodotus respecting the Crimea, *ib.*; respecting the Sea of Azov, 78; position of the Sarmatians, Budinians, Gelonians, Jurcana, Thyssagetans, revolted Scythians, Argippæans, Hyperboreans, Arimaspians and Massagetans, *ib.*; the three rivers described by Herodotus as east of the Borysthenes, 80.

Sharpe (D.) on certain Lycian inscriptions copied by the Rev. E. Daniell, Edward Forbes, Esq., and Lieut. Spratt, R.N., 193.

Skene, his notions as to the origin of the Picts, 119, 120.

Szabó (J.) on the descent of the Magyar from the ancient Persians, 127.

Trithen (F. H.) on the structure of the Russian verb, 96; on the formation of the past tense in certain of the Indo-European languages, 273.

Wager of Law originally meant a finding of pledges to abide some mode of trial, 58; in this country used in reference to one mode of trial only, and hence the secondary meaning which attaches to it in the language of the English Law, *ib.*

Walters (Rev. J.) on the derivatives of the Welsh word *gwy*, 65.

Wedgwood (H.) on the etymology of the word *trap-rock*, 12.

Welsh language. See Celtic languages.

Westergaard's work on the Sanscrit roots, 33.

Wilson (H. H.), a notice of the European grammars and lexicons of the Sanscrit language, 13.

Yates (J.), remarks on English orthography, 7; remarks on a statue of Endymion illustrative of a passage in Lucian, 8.

